

K. Olbyffe (J.)
4
4139.6
4

A THIRD DEFENCE

OF
Ministerial Conformity
TO THE
Church of ENGLAND.

In Answer to
Mr. CALAMY'S *Objections*
against the Former;

IN A
LETTER

Annexed to his
THIRD PART
OF
Moderate Nonconformity.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. Downing for R. Burrough at
the Sun and Moon in Cornhill, 1706.



TO THE
READER.

THE great Design we had in view, both in the Beginning and Progress of this Undertaking, which we have been engaged in, and which we have carefully pursu'd, hath been to vindicate our selves from those Imputations, which by the Representations Mr. Calamy hath given of the Terms of Conformity, were laid upon our Practice, in submitting our selves to the legal Establishment; to the End that we might procure a favourable Opinion of what we have done, by removing the Prejudices, which by such a Representation might be apt to be taken up by unwary Readers against our Office and Ministry. And we shall now closely pursue the same Design, in what we have in hand, in answer to

Mr. Calamy's Letter, and his Index at the End thereof. Whether by this fresh Undertaking (which Mr. Calamy's renewed Assaults have obliged us to) we shall put an End to this Controversy, we are not able to determine: But we shall endeavour to bring it into a very narrow Compass; by cutting off all unnecessary Disputes, which do not properly or directly belong to our Defence; and by shewing to every careful Reader these several Things, viz. How small a Part of our last Defence hath been so much as touch'd upon, or pretended to be answer'd by Mr. Calamy; as also how much he doth concede and grant us under the several Heads; and lastly, How little Force there is in his Objections against what he continueth to oppose. And we shall refer all his Personal and Angry Reflections, and whatsoever is extraneous to our Defence; and all other Mat-

ter
his
tog
wh
cer
von
in
ma
wh
the

ters of lesser Moment, to our Answer to
his Index, that we may more nearly put
together, and take notice of those Things
wherein our Defence is directly con-
cern'd. And in all this we shall endea-
vour to have the Apostles Exhortation still
in our Eye, to pursue the Things that
make for Peace, and the Things
wherewith we may edify one ano-
ther.

John Ollyffe.

THE

ERRATA.

PAGE 38. line 2. for glorified in, read glorified. p. 64.
l. 27. for assent r. assert. p. 66. l. 28. for in r. a. and
after later r. than it is in the Heavens. p. 141. l. 3. after
should r. nor.

THE CONTENTS.

OF our Subscription to the XXth of the XXXIX Articles	pag. 2
Of the Declaration of Assent and Consent	P. 10.
That it is not to the Imposing	P. 11
Our Submission to some Impositions vindicated	P. 13.
Objections against our Submission answered	(P. 18
What the Approbation is which is imply'd therein	P. 25
That it is to the Use only, or Things prescribed	P. 32
Of the Salvation and Regeneration of Infants baptized	P. 42.
Of Godfathers and Godmothers	P. 45.
Of exclusive Terms of Communion, with respect to Baptism	P. 53.

The Contents.

Of the Use of the Sign of the Cross	p. 57
Of excluding from the Lord's-Supper those that dare not Kneel	p. 61
Of the three Orders of Ministry	p. 64
Of the Office of Burial	p. 65
Of the Rule to find out Easter	p. 66
Of the Apocryphal Lessons	p. 67
Of the Old Version of the Psalms	p. 70
Of the Damnatory Sentences	p. 72
Of the Rubrick about Confirmation	p. 76
Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience	p. 77
Of the Canons of 1603	p. 92
Of the Ecclesiastical Courts	p. 94
Of the Advantages which Mr. Calamy pretends to have above us in the Ex- ercise of his Ministry	p. 96
An Answer to Mr. Calamy's Index	p. 133
An Index to this Third Defence; with some Reference to the former.	p. 159

A Third

The Obituaries

the life of the Sign of the Cross	p. 18
excluding from the Lord's Supper	p. 19
that have not Kneel	p. 21
the three Orders of Ministry	p. 24
the Office of Preaching	p. 25
the Rule to find out Easter	p. 26
the Apostolical Lesson	p. 27
the Old Version of the Psalter	p. 28
the Donatist Controversy	p. 29
the Rubric about Confirmation	p. 30
the Oath of Canonical Obedience	p. 31
the Canon of 1603	p. 32
the Ecclesiastical Courts	p. 34
the Advantages which Mr. Calamy	p. 35
pretends to have above us in the Ex-	p. 36
ercise of his Ministry	p. 37
answer to Mr. Calamy's Index	p. 38
Index to this Third Defence	p. 39
some Reference to the former	p. 40
of Salvation and Regeneration	p. 41
of Ministers and Godmothers	p. 42
of the Terms of Communion	p. 43
respect to Baptism	p. 44

A Third

A THIRD
DEFENCE
OF
Ministerial Conformity
TO THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

MR. *Calamy* hath some things in the Beginning of his *Letter*, with respect to the *Ejected Ministers*, the conforming *Puritans*, his Vindication of himself from exposing us to our Brethren, his History of High and Low Church; which, because they do not directly belong to our *Defence of Ministerial Conformity*, we shall either wholly pass by, or only take some little notice of in our *Answer* to his *Index*.

B

And

And as for the Head of *Re-ordination*, which comes next, *He thinks he hath said enough*, and saith, *He is not for needless Repetitions*; and we are as little for them as he; and think that we have fully answered all that he hath said, which he saith, *He hath seriously consider'd*: But what the Result of that *serious Consideration* hath been, he leaveth us in the dark about, and so we shall pass it. Especially considering that this is no Part of our *Defence*; and if he cannot be satisfy'd with what we have advanc'd about that matter, which doth not concern us, we shall leave it as we found it.

Of our Subscription to the 20th Article.

So that all we have now to proceed upon in this our Defence, is contain'd under Three Heads, viz. our Subscription to the 20th of the 39 Articles

The Declaration of Assent and Consent, and the Particulars under it; and the Oath of Canonical Obedience.

I. *Of our Subscription to the 20th Article*
This Article is what he assaulted in his Introduction to his former Book, *Mod. Nonconformity* part 2. and is what is frequently reflected upon, and opposed by him there. This Article saith, *That the Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*; but then presently adds, *That yet it is not lawful for the Church*

of Ministerial Conformity.

3

to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written. The Design of which Article seems originally to be, in Opposition to the Papists, (as very many of the rest were) to assert the Power of *National Churches*, against the Usurpations of the *Church of Rome*, which would have the whole Power of determining all things, both in Faith and Worship; and would oblige all to submit to, and acquiesce in her Determinations alone. For these very Words, which Mr. Calamy now reflects upon, were one main Position maintain'd by the Protestants in that famous Disputation with the Papists *primo Eliz.* set down by Bishop Burnet in the latter End of his *History of the Reformation*. This Claim of *National Churches* against the *Usurpations of Rome*, is at large vindicated, by the same Learned Bishop in the *Articles*, pag. 374.

And we are apt to think, Mr. Calamy himself hath not been long of one Mind in this matter. He tells us, *Abridg. pag. 653*. That two Thirds of the Nonconformists would have come in to the Church upon the Concessions in the Jerusalem Chamber with the further Allowance in Point of Orders made 13 Eliz. Cap. 12. which Allowance is this, That their Ordination should be own'd upon their subscribing to all the 39 Articles. These Terms he seems to have had a good Opinion

of, and consequently of the 20th Article amongst the rest: Yet now he reproacheth and falls foul upon this part of it (being not requir'd to subscribe it by the *Toleration Act*) and writes a good part of his *Introduction* in Opposition to it.

In Defence of the controverted Position of this Article to which we have subscribed, we explain'd from Dr. *Burgess*, what is meant by *Rites and Ceremonies*, viz. *External Circumstances* in the Worship of God, there described and bounded. And Mr. *Calamy* himself now is not for making any difference between *Circumstances* and *Ceremonies* in Divine Worship, though in his former part he was much for having us heed the same. See our *Second Defence* pag. 47. And we shew'd him from the Article, what *Rites, Ceremonies, or Circumstances* of Worship, are here meant, viz. such as are warranted by the Word of God, or such as are not contrary to God's Word written. For the Article presently denies, That the Church hath Power to ordain any such: So that there is an express Limitation in the Article to those only that are not contrary to the Word; that is, for Matter, or Manner, or End, or Use: If any *Circumstances or Ceremonies* upon these, or any other Accounts, are contrary to the Word the Article denies that the Church hath Power

of Ministerial Conformity.

5

to ordain them. And therefore we subscribe to the *Churches Power*, affirm'd in the *Article*, with respect only to those that are not so contrary. And this is all that the *Article* saith of this matter, or that we are obliged by it to own: and one would think there should be no great Harm in all this.

And for the better Elucidation of this, we gave him a large Induction and Enumeration of Scripture-Instances, of such Sort of Rites and Ceremonies in the *Old Testament*, which had their Original only from the *Jewish Church*, without any Divine Command enjoying the same, notwithstanding they had so many Rituals of Divine Appointment, and such severe Prohibitions in the Law, of adding any thing to the Word of God. We shew'd that some were approved by our Lord himself, and some by his Apostles; two of which had Reference to one of the Sacraments, viz. the *Lords Supper*; one of which [the *Kiss of Love*] us'd after Prayer, and before the Administration of it, as Dr. *Whitby* observes out of *Justin Martyr*. See *Whitby* on *Rom. 16. 16.* Of this sort are those which Mr. *Baxter* mentions and approves of, *Christ Direct. part 3. Qu. 133.* as which Translation of the Bible to be us'd in Churches; the Manner or Tune in singing of Psalms; what Version or Metre to use; whether

to pray in the same Words often, or in various
to use a written, or printed Form, or neither;
to read it on the Book, or to speak it by Me-
mory; to have Sponsors or Witnesses of the
Parents Trustiness, or the Child's Covenant, or
no; whether there shall be any Musick by In-
struments in the Church, for the Praises of God,
and what; by what Sign or Ceremony we shall
take an Oath; what Words the Churches Pro-
fession of Faith shall be express'd by; and by
what Sign the Church shall signify their Con-
sent: So for decent Habits of Cloths, and for
decent Gestures not particularly commanded;
what Gesture to receive the Lord's Supper in;
in which, he saith, the Scripture no more regu-
lates us, than about the Room, the Hour of
communicating, the Number of Communicants,
the Place, &c.

Some things Mr. Calamy himself doth not
deny, but that there may be general Regula-
tions of, viz. such as are necessary or expedi-
ent; without which the Worship of God cannot
be perform'd. Now this is enough or suffi-
cient to the Defence of this Article now before
us, which speaks not of these particular Ce-
remonies or Circumstances, which are the
matter of Dispute, but of such Rites or Ce-
remonies in the general, as are warranted or
allowed by the Word, to be determin'd or
decreed by the Church, without deciding there-
in,

in, which or which not, she is thereby warranted to decree; nor doth it speak any thing of the enforcing *Penalties*, for the Observation of what is decreed; in which therefore we are no way concern'd neither, in our Subscription hereunto.

In our *second Defence* indeed we did proceed further, for the sake of those that scrupled the Churches *Power* in the determining these Rites or Circumstances, which are now contested among us; hoping thereby we might give some Satisfaction to them therein; to which we refer the Reader, as also to the latter part of the *Letter* directed to me, before our *Second Defence* was published. But this was no necessary Part of our *Defence* of this *Article*: And therefore, because we are willing to make this Controversie (as far as we are concern'd in it) as short as may be, we shall add no more about that matter. The *Article* is only an indefinite Proposition, design'd, as we have said, against *Papal Usurpations* upon *National Churches*: And it is sufficient to warrant our Subscription to it, to believe in the general, That the Church hath Power to decree some such *Ceremonies* or Circumstances; though we should think she is not warranted by the Word, to decree any more than Mr. *Calamy* allows: nor do we see any thing that is or can be objected against it.

There is only one thing that we shall farther take notice of, with respect to the *Churches Power* in these matters; that according to Mr. Calamy, it doth properly belong to every *particular worshipping Assembly* only, to determine all *indifferent Circumstantials* of Worship; whereas we think it very reasonable, that when there are *some* indifferent Circumstantials, which may concern *all* worshipping Assemblies in a Nation alike, that they should have a more *general Regulation* or Determination. There may be indeed *some* indifferent Circumstantials, which it may be most proper for every *particular Congregation* to determine for themselves; but for *those* which concern the Worship of *all Assemblies* alike, one would think, in the very Reason of the thing, it should be more proper to have them *nationally* or *provincially* determined, for the greater *Order* or Uniformity-sake, suitably to the Nature of such *larger*, or more extensive *Societies*, to which a suitable *Power* and *Government* must also necessarily belong. For where there are *Societies* there must be *Government* to preserve the Peace, Regularity and Order thereof: So in *Provincial* and *National Societies*, consisting in the Combinations of lesser particular ones, there must be *Provincial* and *National Government*, suitable to their Nature and Extent, For if the *lesser Societies*

of Ministerial Conformity. 9

Societies cannot subsist without Government; when the distinct Interests and Apprehensions of Men are fewer; much less can the greater *Societies* subsist in Peace and Order, without a *Government* proper to their large-ness. So that for a National Society there must be National Government; as for a particular Congregational Society, there needs a particular or Congregational Government. As it is impossible there should be Order in any *Corporation*, without Orders relating to it; so neither can a *Nation* be governed without such peculiar to the whole.

— Give to thy Mother what thou wilt allow
To every Corporation. Herbert.

It is allowed that there cannot be Order in any particular *Congregation*, without some *Rules* obligatory to the same; so neither can Order be observed by the *Churches* of a *Kingdom*, unless united by some Common *Laws* obligatory to the whole; which Union doth constitute a *National Hierarchy*.

And now where there is *Government* greater or lesser, there must be *Power* too, for fixing and determining proper Regulations in that Society, to which the Government belongs. Government without *Power* is no Government at all, or of no Use: So that
Power

Power is essential to *Government*, of what Nature or Form soever it be. And as there must be *Civil Power* for *Civil Government* for regulating Men in their *Civil Acts*; so in *Ecclesiastical Government*, there must be *Ecclesiastical Power* for those things that are proper thereto. And both *Government*, and *Power* arise from the general *Nature* and *Necessities* of *Society*, and the *Confusions* and *Miscarriages*, that it is subject to without it. And where the *Government* is, there is the *Power*; and where the *Government* extends further than single *Congregations*, so doth the *Power*. And where there is a *National Society* of *Christian Professors confederated* together in a *Christian Government*, it is sufficient if there be a *Grant of Power* given by their *Consent* to their *Representatives*, to settle common *Regulations* that may be necessary or expedient for the publick *Peace* or *Order*, whether in purely *Civil* or *Ecclesiastical Cases*, without needing any further *Debate* about *Church-Power*.

II. We come now to the Declaration of Assent and Consent, which Mr. Calamy saith, is a capital part of this Controversie. And there are these two things to be considered with relation thereunto, viz. The Imposition imply'd; and our Approbation of

of, and Consent to those things in which it doth consist, and how far it extends; which we shall therefore severally, but briefly consider.

1st. Of the *Imposition*. Here is indeed an *Imposition* imply'd That it is not to the imposing. of several things to be used by those, who have the Liberty of publick Ministration in the establish'd Church. Here is an *Imposition* of a *Liturgy*, consisting of several *Offices*; here is an *Imposition* of certain Habits, Signs, Modes and Gestures to be used in the several *Offices*: Concerning all which we consider in this place, that our *Approbation*, *Assent* and *Consent* does respect the *Use* of these things that are impos'd, not the *Imposition* of them: We are not requir'd to give Assent and Consent to the *Imposing*, or to give our Approbation thereof, but only of the *Use*, when they are impos'd. We are not at all concerned in the *imposing*, nor are we bound to declare that ~~that~~ was well done, either in it self, or in its Circumstances. The *Imposition* is the Act of our Governours, and is past and over; our *Declaration* respects what we are to do hereafter our selves. Our Governours do not expect or demand that we should pass a Judgment of *Approbation* upon their Act, but upon those things that belong to our own. In the *Twentieth Article* indeed we subscribe to the *Power of decreeing*
or

or *imposing*; but then it is only in general, (as we have shewn) and the Particulars are not express'd. Here we declare our Assent and Consent to the Use of the Particulars, but not to the *Imposition* of them at all.

Now 'tis the *Imposing*, that Mr. Calamy saith, *he is principally against*: And it is against that, that a great Part of his *Introduction* is directed. Well, he may enjoy his own Opinion in that Matter, and so may others for all this Declaration; in which we only declare our Assent to the Use on our Part, and not to the *Imposing* on the *Governours* Part. This Distinction Mr. Calamy allows, and himself insists upon with Reference to the Ministers that afterward were ejected. *Mod. Non. part 3. p. 84.* There is, saith he, a double Judgment to be allowed for; a Judgment what Terms to fix in the Establishment, and a Judgment how far the Terms that are fix'd by the Establishment, may warrantably and safely be comply'd with. And then he shews us most rightly; that as the one is accountable to God for the Terms fixed, so are the others for their Compliance or Non-Compliance with those Terms. Hence he tells us, *p. 86.* That they [the Ejected Ministers] could, generally speaking, have come into the Establishment, had King Charles his Declaration past into a Law.

But

But what if a Thing be sinfully impos'd, or without due Authority, which may in it self be lawfully us'd? (for Circumstances do often mightily vary or alter an Act) Must not we consider, you'll say, the Lawfulness of the Imposition, as well as the Lawfulness of the Thing impos'd? Or may we promise a stated Compliance with a lawful Thing, when the Imposition is sinful, and there is no Authority for it? Would not this be to betray our Liberties, and to share in the Sin of the Imposition, by our joining with it, and encouraging of it? This is what sticks with Mr. Calamy, and he is against the Submission for the imposing sake. Governours no doubt may be sometimes guilty of an Encroachment of Power; and may decree or ordain what is not in the Verge of it; and the Imposition may be unprofitable, or unreasonable, or with too great Rigour, or too severe Penalties: There may be Humour, or there may be Passion, or there may be Inconveniencies like to ensue, that may be to the Detriment of a great Part of the Society: And to speak freely, we are, as well as our Brethren, for preserving our Liberties both Civil and Sacred. The Liberties of Men should not be restrain'd but for the Publick Good, or the Benefit of the Society to which they

they belong: And where the *Inconveniencies* are greater than the *Conveniencies*, it is highly *unreasonable*. But then we consider with all, that this is often a very *dubious* Case; and we are not always able to judge how far the Power and Authority may extend, nor of the other Things that do accompany the Imposition: And in such a *doubtful* Case, which we are very often not competent Judges of, it must be then the *safest* way to submit, because we cannot be sure, but that the Power may extend so far. They can oblige us to some Things, and we have general Commands for Subjection to them; and when it is not very clear, that their Commands are exorbitant or without their Verge; in that Case it is only *lawful* or *unlawful* that we must determine our selves by. But suppose, for Argument sake, the Matter be clear and evident to us, that the Power is extended too far in that Case, We say not that Submission is a *Duty* on our part, out of Conscience to the Command; for it may be argued, that where there is no rightful Authority to command, there can be no Obligation to Obedience: But yet if the Things be *lawful* that they Command, tho' they may not have *rightful* Power to abridge us of our *Liberty*; yet we may voluntarily quit it, if we will, for Peace sake, and the avoiding

avoiding other Inconveniencies that would be more detrimental to the Society, than such Submission would be: And we must profess, that we are mightily for Peace, as well as for Liberty. Peace is a most valuable Purchase, though it should be at the Expence of some Liberties, that may well be spared without any Damage. It is worth the while, and it is the true Nature and Notion of Publick-spirituedness, to yield up our own Rights, even those sometimes which we cannot conveniently spare, for the preserving of the Publick Peace; and much more those that we may spare, without any Damage to our selves. And in Case of indifferent and lawfull Things (supposing that we are satisfy'd that they are so) wherein we may limit or restrain our selves, we cannot apprehend, that it is any considerable Damage to us, to submit to the Imposition, or Restraint of others for Peace and Union sake. As the minor Part (according to Mr. Calamy) doth and should do when the major Part determines a Matter in a dissenting Congregation. Yea thus we may be obliged to submit upon other Accounts, though not on the Account of the Power to impose, viz. on the Account of Peace and Unity, and the Commands of God in Scripture respecting them.

And

And again, We are many times as little able to judge of the *vitiating Circumstance* of a Command or Imposition on the Governours Part, though there should be such as we are of the *Extent* of their Power; nor can we be accountable for them by our Submission. It would be a very hard Case, if an *Inferior*, in *Performance* of any Act of Obedience to the Command of one that is over Him, must be *responsible* for all the Circumstances of his Command, if He doth obey; or must *demur* in his Obedience, till He is satisfy'd therein; though He be never so well satisfy'd of the Matter of his Command. Unless *Lawful* or *Unlawful* only be the Boundaries, one way or other, in such Cases, that we must attend to, it is hard to know when we are obliged or when not.

If we apprehended that the Things determined or imposed, were *unlawful in themselves*, or contrary to the Divine Law, which is superiour to all Humane Ordinances, We hope we should be as much against submitting to them, as Mr. Calamy can be, or any other Person: For we would not fight or contend against God, but *must obey God rather than Men*. But whilst we think them *lawful in themselves*, and incur no Harm, and commit no Sin in the Use of them, we cannot allow our selves in a Refusal of Obedience

ence, when our Governours demand it of us. We think we are bound by the general Commands, That every Soul should be subject to the Higher Powers, and that we should obey them that have the Rule over us; when upon Examination we find the Things commanded are not sinful, nor any way hurtful to us, and they insist upon our Submission thereunto. And we could not excuse our selves from an unreasonable Stiffness and Refractoriness, if we should refuse, or do otherwise. They that have another View of Things, and apprehend Unlawfulness in them, must necessarily be excused, whilst these Apprehensions continue; for no Man ought to act contrary to the Evidence of Things appearing to him, when he can have no other View but of the Unlawfulness of them; But where the Lawfulness of the Things appears with Light and Evidence, and there is no Hurt or Damage comes to us thereby, it seems to us to be much the safer way to be on the side of Submission, than of that which contradicteth and opposeth; and to leave the Judgment of Expediency and Conveniency to others, which is most properly the Enquiry of our Governours. It is Mr. Baxter's Doctrine quoted 2. Def. p. 73. *Think not that is unlawful to be obey'd, which is unlawfully commanded: for we shall not be judg'd by these*

Laws of God, which made the Rulers Duty, but by that which made our own. And Mr. Calamy himself stands to his Assertion, Letter p. 302. That a Magistrate may oblige his Subjects to attend on the Worship of God in the way ---- against which they do not pretend so much as Matter of Conscience. Only he adds now, That there may be just Matter of Conscience pretended against a Way of Worship, which yet is so far lawful, as that serious Persons may obtain the Divine Blessing. By which he means, that he and others may have just Grounds not to submit: This is to himself and them; As for us, we do not pretend Matter of Conscience against the Way of Worship impos'd; and therefore, according to him, the Magistrate may oblige us to Conformity; and we, and others who are alike persuaded of the Lawfulness thereof, are bound to submit.

But there are two Things that Mr. Calamy urgeth against our Submission to the present Impositions.

The one is, That our stated Compliance with them would encourage the Imposers, and be likely to prove a Temptation to a further Progress in the way of Impositions. Let. p. 304. If we do this, it is certainly by Accident only:

We encourage others indeed, our Fellow-Subjects, by our Compliance with the Impositions, to comply as we do; because that is an Act of the same kind with our own; and by doing as we do, we give an Example to others to do so likewise. *Imposition* is the Governours Act, and is an Act of one kind, proceeding upon certain Reasons in them; but *Submission* is our Act, and is an Act of another kind, and proceeds upon other Reasons in our selves. Now, how does our Act that is of one kind, and for Reasons proper to us, justify and excuse that of others, which is of another kind, and that proceeds upon Reasons proper to them? And if our Act does not justify or excuse anothers, How does it encourage it, unless it be per accidens? But are accidental Consequences, that proceed upon other Reasons in others, to be imputed to Us as our Act, that is not concern'd in, and doth not proceed upon those Reasons? We cannot perceive the Consequence of these Things. There is no Doubt but they that are in Power may take Occasion by the Compliance of others with their Commands, to exert their Power in further extravagant Commands: But that is to be imputed to the Corruption of those that are in Power; and when they thus use it ill or unprofitably, our present Compliance with

what is lawful in it self, cannot *in its own* Nature be interpreted to contribute to the occasional Abuse. While therefore there is nothing commanded but what we judge lawful in it self, and not hurtful to us, still we esteem our own Submission lawful, and we may take other ways to remonstrate against the Unprofitableness, the Humourisme Encroachments and Abuses of Power, while it exerts it self only in Commands, that respect such Matters, as are not forbid by the Laws of God or Man, nor bring us any real Damage; nor doth our Compliance obstruct a further Reformation neither, but only per accidens, as it may be abused to that Purpose by others.

And if we are chargeable with encouraging Impositions and hindring Reformation by our Submission, Mr. Calamy himself must be chargeable with the same. For he himself hath given an occasional Compliance with some of them, and a stated Compliance with others. He endeavours indeed to wipe himself clear, and denys that Occasional Conformity does encourage Impositions, because he does not thereby own their Power, but only shew his Charity. Neither do we by our constant Compliance necessarily own their Power, or the Extent of it to such and such things, but shew our Profitableness. The

Truth

Truth is, neither he or we do really encourage any undue Impositions, present or future, by complying with the Commands of our Governours in lawful Things; but he, no more than we, can hinder their taking Encouragement thereby. We have declar'd as freely against the Continuance of some Impositions, as he; yet for all that he judgeth our Submission, to what we think lawful, doth encourage them: on the same Account his charitable Compliance with the Impositions, which he would have remov'd, is judged by our Congregational Brethren to be an Encouragement likewise thereof. He may see plainly therefore how vain the Argument is, by whomsoever urg'd, against his or our Compliance in this Matter, that some may take Encouragement thereby to continue the Impositions, when there is no Encouragement really given.

And hath not Mr. Calamy himself likewise a stated Compliance with some Impositions? Hath not he himself submitted to as great an Imposition, as any other whatsoever, in order to the legal Exercise of his Ministry, viz. a Subscription to 36 Articles, by which he doth as much own the Power, and encourage the Impositions, as if he had submitted to 300, that he was equally satisfy'd in? And do not his Brethren do the like? Doth not he

statedly submit to an *imposed Ceremony* of Humane Invention, that whole Churches have declar'd against in other Countries, every time he takes an Oath, by touching the Evangelists, and kissing the Book; by which Ceremony he signifies his asserting the Truth of what he swears, as he believes the Truth of the Gospel? Of which see more in our *2d. Def.* Now if he thinks it blame worthy *in us* to submit to Impositions, for fear of encouraging a further Progress therein, Why has *he himself* done it? These Things did certainly deserve his Consideration; and if he does not afford us one Word of Answer, our Argument will be thought to have more in it, than he was willing to trouble himself about.

But there is another Thing, that he objects against our *Submission* to Impositions in lawful Things, *That if we submit to the present Impositions, 'tis hard to know where we shall stop*; which he stands to, *Letter p. 306.* this we had answer'd *2d. Def. p. 86.* We shew'd him what Care the Church had taken to prevent the Danger he alledges; and yet if any new Impositions are made, we are under no Obligation to comply with them, till we have examin'd them, and are satisfy'd in the Lawfulness and Expediency of our Submission; and that thereupon we are as free

as he. This he denieth, because we own the Power of the Church to decree lawful Things, which he does not. But does not he own a Power to impose in Church-Affairs, if Subscription to impos'd Articles be an owning such a Power, as in us he suppoeth it is? It is difficult indeed to fix or state the Bounds of Power, and therefore, as we said before, we think it safest to submit; and in some Cases, if there were no Power, or an Invasion of Power, we should notwithstanding comply, and so we think should he too, for Peace-sake; till the Damage that comes thereby were no further supportable. And if any thing be impos'd upon him or us, which he or we judge lawful in all its Circumstances to be done, then is he as much oblig'd to comply as we, being under the same Law of Obedience to Governours; and if any thing be impos'd on us or Him, which we or he judge not lawful in all its Circumstances to be done, then are we no more oblig'd thereunto than he; and this is what we meant by being as free as he.

That which we have said in this Matter is this: That when we declare our Assent and Consent to the Use of Things impos'd, supposing them lawful, we are not bound thereby to declare for the Imposing them, to approve of it, or assent and consent to it.

I shall now conclude this, with telling Mr. Calamy one short Story of a Matter, that hath happened of late. "There was a certain Person, a Master of a Family, who call'd to his Son, a Young-man of about one or two and twenty, to read a Chapter in the Bible. The Young-man, it seems, had white Gloves on his Hands, when he came to read. The Father bids him put off his white Gloves. The Son refuseth; he saw no Harm in them: The Father insists upon it. At last, I think, the Son comply'd so far as to pull off one; but that did not satisfie the Father, who after a short time goes to a Minister, and desires him to reprove and instruct his Son. Why, saith the Minister, Is your Son a Drunkard, or one that takes bad Courses? Oh no, saith the Father, he is a very honest sober Young-man. Why, what then, saith the Minister? Then the Father tells him the Story of his Obstinacy before related. The Minister upon this took the Son's Part, and defended his Refractoriness and Refusal, and being a Friend of Mr. Calamy's, chid the Father for his Imposition; for if this, saith he, be allow'd, it will destroy Mr. Calamy's Introduction. Now we will appeal to Mr. Calamy, whether this Minister was a good Calvinist or no. For our

parts

parts we should have chid and reprov'd the Father for his *humoursome Command* (unless he had just Reasons for it, which we know not) and the Son for his *humoursome Disobedience*, though perhaps we should incur the Displeasure of both thereby, as it commonly falls out in such Cases. This is indeed a negative Instance, in imposing a Forbearance of some things that another has a Mind to, and of his Refusal of Submission: but whether it be positive or negative, Imposition is Imposition still; and the Non-compliance in one Case or another is much alike in the Nature of the Thing: And we shall leave Mr. Calamy to apply it.

2dly, Concerning the Declaration we consider further, That as the Assent and Consent is to the Use of the Things impos'd, and not to the Imposition; so the Approbation given and imply'd

What the Approbation is, that is imply'd in the Assent and Consent.

therein is also only in Reference to the Use. We own the Act mentions the Word Approbation in several Places; we us'd the Word in our 1 Def. p. 22. we at large insist upon it, and give an Account of it, 2 Def. p. 116, 117, 118. He had said, that Approbation was not Use. No indeed, say we, but Approbation is contain'd in Assent and Consent to the Use.

It

It is not to be suppos'd that a Man can *assent and consent to the Use* of a Thing, without an *Approbation* thereof as lawful and fit to be us'd. So that there was little Reason for that uncharitable Insinuation, with which he began upon me, *Letter p. 308. You seem, saith he, to think, you did well to assent and consent, and that barely to the Use of what is prescrib'd.* Whereas for my Part, saith he, *in the Worship of God, I should not assent and consent to what I did not approve of.* As if we did otherwise: so indeed he had represented us before, as giving *Assent and Consent* to get in to the establish'd Church, and yet to remain as dissatisfy'd with some Things, as those who for them are kept out of it; notwithstanding that we have own'd and defended, that there must be *Approbation* in order to Use. And therefore what he saith to Mr. Hoadly, *Let. p. 374* is merely frivolous; *The Subscription*, saith he *oblig'd to a bare Use, but now say the Imposers by the Declaration, You shall declare for the Use of the Common-Prayer, &c. in such a Form of Words, as shall imply an Approbation:* And yet this Assent and Consent is exprest to be to the Use just before, so that the *Approbation* can be but in Reference to the Use; and it is no more, nor yet in it self so much,

And we think it a strange Supposition, and manifestly unjust, when he saith in the same place, *That it was actually the Case of the old Puritans, to be content to use several things that they could not unfeignedly approve of.* By the *old Puritans*, we mean, as he must here, not the *Nonconformists*, but those *Bishops* and *Conformable Ministers*, upon whom that Name was reproachfully and publickly cast, whom for Distinction-sake he elsewhere calls, *The Conforming Puritans*. We profess our selves the Admirers, and (though unworthy) Followers of these Men; and therefore we cannot without Concern read this Reflection of Mr. Calamy upon them. In his former Book p. 122. he speaks modestly, *The old Puritans*, saith he, *us'd the Common Prayer, but they would never have declar'd their Approbation of the strict Imposition of it.* This was true, although nothing to the purpose; for neither are we, any more than they, call'd to approve of the *strict Imposition*. Nay, we freely grant, that we count the *strict imposing* of some things a *Burden*, because of the Quarrels, and Animosities, and Dissentions that are occasioned thereby, to the great Prejudice of Religion, and exposing us to the subtle Attempts of our Enemies: And therefore we desire rather, out of Compassion to our Brethren, and Regard to the publick Peace;
and

and considering the little Advantage that there comes by the retaining of some things; or how far short those Advantages are of the Mischiefs on the other side, which they do not counterbalance; I say, in consideration of these things, we desire rather that they might be removed: But then, to say that the *Puritans us'd what they did not approve of*, is to cast a worse Reflection upon them, than ever their sharpest Adversaries did. But when he *useth them* so, we do not wonder that he should *use us* after this manner; as if we gave our Assent and Consent to what we are dissatisfied with: This in our Second Defence p. 117. we think we had reason to call a Slanderous Reflection; and yet now in this Letter p. 316. he pretends to prove, and make it good upon me, in the Instance of the Office of Burial; he saith, *I know it is to be used over all, but such as die unbaptiz'd or excommunicate*; and yet in the Case of some, would rather take my Horse and ride out of Town, than stay and perform the Office. *I know it is to be used over all.* What does he mean when he tells me, that *I know this*. If he had never read any thing, that I had published, how could he say that *I know this*? for I might have been ignorant of it? But to tell me, *I know this*, when I have profess'd to believe, and prov'd the quite contrary,

trary, *Second Defence* p. 204. (to which he does not return one Word of Answer) is what I could not have expected from any body; and I cannot but hope that my Brethren of the Nonconformists will testify their Dislike of it. The most that can be infer'd from what I have publish'd about this matter, is, That if a Case should happen, in which I should be dissatisfy'd about the Application of this Office (in which I prov'd I was not obliged to use it) I would avoid it with as much Prudence, and little Noise, as I could. He talks of *hard Words*, and *says* as he *shall not study to return*, when yet he persists still to defend his *Reflection* by a downright *false Supposition*.

In all this then, we say, that *Approbation* we allow, but it is *Approbation of the Use*, or *Approbation in reference to the Use*, that is contain'd or imply'd in the *Declaration of Assent and Consent*. So far we go, and so far the *old Puritans* went in their Practices, and further than this we are not bound to go. But Mr. Calamy in the *Tenth Chapter* of his *Abridgment*, for two Pages together, viz. 503, 504. expresseth himself with relation to this Business, in Words that have another Meaning in them, viz. as if our *Assent and Consent* signify'd the *highest Justification and Commendation of every Point and Syllable*, every

Rite

Rite and Ceremony, every Matter and Thing contain'd in the whole Book, and in every Page and Line of it; as if there could not possibly be any Alteration made in one Word or Expression in it for the better (as he there goes on to explain himself.) This Sense and Meaning we justly rejected; and Mr. Colenby himself now owns, that he meant it only as hyperbolical. I frankly assure you, saith he, Letter pag. 315. I mention'd the Words as hyperbolical. But certainly then he ought to have given us notice thereof one way or another; or else we assure him, we never desire to learn Rhetorick from him. We always understood, that Tropes and Figures were to be so form'd, as not to be apt to deceive, and that it is in this, that they differ from downright Falsities: And we assure him, that we (and we believe many of his Readers besides) were deceived thereby. Mr. Hoady, it is plain, thought he intended them to be literally understood: and accordingly we wrote against that Sense. And for him to tell us now, that he understood it as exceeding the Truth all the while [*excedit Hyperbole verum*] That he meant it as an Hyperbole, when he had been in such a high Strain of Words aggravating the Terms of Conformity; if this be fair dealing, let any Man judge; and if this be Rhetorick, it would

tempo

tempt one to say with the Quakers, That that Art is to lye by a Figure. If the old Puritans could not approve the Common-Prayer as the most complete and perfect in this Sense, it is no wonder; nor are we now bound to do it, by Mr. Calamy's own Concession.

He grants his first Charge thus to be Figure and Floarish; and now adds, Letter pag. 315. All that I understood thereby was this, That the assenting and consenting to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd, was too much for a Book, that contains many things liable to just Exceptions; and that the Ministers, that were ejected, had good Reason to refuse such an Assent and Consent. A strange Diminution of that Hyperbolical Stuff for almost two Pages together in his Tenth Chapter. Is this all that he understands by it? No doubt, all those that have Exceptions, which to them appear just, against the use of any thing prescrib'd, are bound to refuse Assent and Consent to, or Approbation of the Use thereof. And we doubt not, but the Ejected Ministers, who thought they had such just Exceptions, acted conscientiously in the Refusal thereof; And this is all we plead for, That they who have no such just Exceptions, may declare their Assent and Consent to what is prescrib'd: so that the Controversie turns upon this, Whether there are any such just Exceptions against,

gainst any thing that is *prescribed* to be used, or no? (which we are willing to come to a fair Trial of) and not upon the *Assent and Consent* it self, as if that was a thing of such a terrible Nature, and contained in it such a frightful Sense, as he had given of it. So indeed he himself, *Abridg. p. 602.* brings in the Great *Man in the Secret* declaring openly in the *House of Lords*, That if the *Assent and Consent* were taken away, Ministers were bound to the same things, by other Obligations. It is not therefore the *Assent and Consent* it self, but the *Matters* that are to be assented and consented to, are to be the Subject of the Dispute. And so his withdrawing his Charge in the literal Meaning, is a giving up the Cause concerning *Assent and Consent* in its own Nature, which he hath been so eagerly disputing about; his first Charge being impossible to be maintained, which is now owned by him to be an *Hyperbole*.

3ly, We consider further touching the *Declaration of Assent and Consent*, that it is to be understood only as to the Use of all and every thing prescribed or enjoyn'd in the Book of Common-Prayer to be used and practised; and not to the *Doctrines and Positions* contain'd in the *Preface Rubricks*, &c. that is, We give our Assent

That it is to the Use only, of things prescribed.

finisg

and Consent to the *Use of the Offices*, and all the *Rites and Ceremonies* prescribed therein; not to *Propositions* that are not contain'd in those *Offices*, nor prescrib'd for Use or Practice to us. This we have proved in our *First and Second Defence*; and it is fully explain'd and confirm'd in a printed *Letter* directed to me, part of which relating to this Matter, we have transcribed in our *Second Defence*, p. 124, &c. which we take to have great Weight in it, though Mr. Calamy is pleas'd to pass it by. And he has also omitted the Consideration of our Reply to many things which before he laid great stress upon. So that we must desire the Reader to have Recourse to what we have already discoursed of these matters, for his Satisfaction therein; that we may not be guilty of needless Repetitions. And Mr. Calamy himself has given such an Explication of the Design and Sense of the *Declaration*, by the pretended Difference between that and the *Subscription*, in his *Letter* to Mr. Hoadly, p. 374. as plainly shews he thinks himself it was to the Use of the Book, and of its Offices, that it was design'd, and not to the Propositions, &c. only he saith, That an *Approbation* was also intended; which we have granted, and consider'd before, and prov'd, That that also has reference to the *Use*: So that we might dismiss the contested Propositions about the

Salvation of Infants, the three Orders of Ministers, &c. as not belonging to the Declaration, and so not concern'd in the Defence: But yet being satisfied our selves of the Truth of them, we shall consider them, as we have done, for the fuller Vindication of the *Book of Common Prayer*; and shall endeavour to answer the Objections that Mr. Calamy hath advanc'd with relation thereunto.

There is yet one thing only remains, as an Objection against the Sense of the Declaration, which we have given, taken from the *Journal of the House of Lords*, which Mr. Calamy doth still much insist upon, and which, he thinks, doth clear this matter fully, and saith, *The whole Debate turns upon it.* This he now tells us, he hath search'd, though he had not inform'd us of so much before, but left us only to guess from whence he had the Story: And he doth now insult us unmercifully, because at Forty Miles distance from London, we had not the Opportunity of searching the Records as well as he. Nor did we think it material, but were ready to take the Representation of the matter of Fact, which he had given us, from whomsoever he had it. Now the matter it seems, was this: A Year after the Act of Uniformity, there being a Bill sent up from the Commons to the Lords, for the Relief of some Persons that had been disabled by Sickness or other

wife from making the Declaration in due time, the Lords, among other Amendments, added a Clause in these Words, *And be it Enacted and declared by the Authority aforesaid, That the Declaration and Subscription of Assent and Consent in the said Act mentioned, shall be understood only, as to the Practice and Obedience to the said Act, and not otherwise.* But this could not be carried, the Clause was rejected, and the Lords acquiesc'd in the Rejection. And Mr. Calamy's Comment upon it is this, *viz.* That the Reason of the Commons, upon their Debate amongst themselves for the rejecting of the Clause was, because they would have more understood by Assenting, Consenting and Subscribing, than to the Use; that upon a Debate between the two Houses, they offer'd their Reasons to the Lords; and that a Majority of the Lords was convinc'd thereby, that more ought to be meant by the Declaration than to the Use. This Sense of things Mr. Calamy is so confident of, that, pag. 311. he saith, *Give a reason for it* [*viz.* the Matter of Fact agreed on] *if you can, besides this, viz.* the Comment that he had made upon it, which we have fairly represented. We accept his Challenge, and shall do that and more. We will,

1. *Assign another Reason for the Rejecting that Clause by the Commons, and the Lords*

agreeing with them in so doing. Mr. Calamy himself saith, pag. 313. *We must not look for Reasons in the Journal, either of Lords or Commons; for that is a rare thing; they enter Fact without Reasons, unless it be of late.* We believe then, that this may be a very likely Reason of the Lords Clause, viz. that Compassion which they bore to the Nonconformists, who, they observ'd, put such a hard Sense on the Declaration, as Mr. Calamy and others have since done: contrary to the true Intent and Meaning of the Law, to their own great Prejudice; and because of this, they were willing to have it declared for their satisfaction, that it should not be understood in that extensive or rigorous Sense, in which they took it; as it was not indeed the Sense of the Law it self, which did confine it to the Use of the Book only, and the things prescribed in it. And as for the Reason of the Commons rejecting that Clause, They on the other side had not that Compassion for the Nonconformists as the moderate Peers had (as appear'd also more afterwards, by their Voting that the Comprehension-Bill prepared by Bishop Wilkins Lord Chief Justice Hales, &c. should not so much as be brought into the House.) They were willing enough to let the Dissenters continue under their Mistake, and to let them alone to put that hard Sense upon the Declaration, without giving them any Ease therein.

may, *some* of them might go so far, as not to think it for the Interest of the Church, to have that or other means us'd to bring them in; but rather that the doing so might be, in the Opinion of some Bigots, *destructive to the Church of England*. The *Commons* might also think that the Law was plain enough already; but if the Dissenters would mistake, let them mistake; their Company did not seem to them so desirable, as that there should be that Satisfaction given. It does not at all appear, that this was their *own* Sense of the Law, that more was meant than *to the Use*; but this was the *Nonconformists* mistake of the Sense of it, which the *Commons* were willing enough to let them alone in. And when the *Lords* could not prevail to have this Mistake clearly rectify'd, they were fain to acquiesce in what was done. But seeing how things were wrong taken, they were willing to have things set right, and the true Sense to be *de-clar'd* (as the Word is in the Clause) and *Enacted*; And this appearing to be their Sense *then* the next year, they being a standing Body, it is justly presumable, that it was their Sense too at the first enacting; And so it might be of the *Commons* too, for any thing that Mr. *Calamy* has shewn to the contrary; which sufficiently overthrows Mr. *Calamy's* Comment or Conclusion; for when another

Reason or *likely Cause* can be assign'd of an Act, it is sufficient to overthrow the Presence of the *Necessity* of that which is assign'd: for a *Necessity* can never consist with a contrary *Likelihood* or *Probability*, which in this Matter, we have fairly suggested. And if we only say, that for any thing that appears to the contrary, That *may* be the Reason which we have given of the Commons rejecting the Clause mention'd; and That *may not* be the Reason which Mr. Calamy has given, then is his Argument from it utterly lost; so that the only certain way of deciding this Matter is to come at last to the *Texture* of the Law it self, and to that we appeal. But as we said, we shall do more than this, *viz.*

2. Make it appear, that it is very *highly improbable* that his Comment should be true; (*viz.* that the Commons should be sway'd by certain *Reasons*, to judge, that more ought to be meant by this Declaration than to the Use; and then should produce those *Reasons* to the *Lords*, and convince a Majority of them thereby) for if such *Reasons* were given, they must have all these Properties; They must be *very weighty and strong*, because they convinc'd the *Lords* and chang'd their Minds: They must be *very open and publick*, being first debated in the House of Commons,

of Ministerial Conformity. 39

Commons, then delivered to the *Lords*, and then again debated amongst them: They must, lastly, be of general Concern; Multitudes of Persons without Doors being nearly concern'd therein. Now though *Reasons* (as he saith) were not entred into the Journal in those Days, as of late; yet we say, it is highly improbable that *Reasons* of so general a Concern, and so publickly debated, should be forgotten and utterly obliterated out of the Minds of Men, if such there were. Could such *Reasons* be brought forth, which convinc'd the *Lords*, they might possibly also convince us; at least there would be some found, who would have urg'd them, as being themselves convinc'd thereby. But when we ask'd, *Why they made no Profelytes without Doors, &c?* He answers, Letter p. 313. *We put him to it ----- He does not think himself oblig'd to account for the Matter, he will leave us to guess.* But if no Cause can be assigned, why such pretended *Reasons*, suppos'd to be of such Weight in themselves, of such Concern to many, and so publick with all, should be immediately and utterly stifled, and no Book written against them, or in Defence of them, when the Controversie about the Declaration was begun from the very first; Then it is highly probable that no such *Reasons* were given for the Equity

of any other Sense, than what was presently accounted and pleaded for, by Dr. Fulwood and others, and has been so constantly since.

But though Mr. Calamy does not think himself concern'd to account for this Matter, yet presently after, p. 314. he puts in his guess; That no one ever appear'd against the Sense of Fulwood, Falkner, Stillingfleet, and Sherlock, because they would leave it to Men of our Sense to draw Persons into the Church, &c. and so they combin'd together to stifle the Reasons of the Commons for the other Sense, that there appear not the least Footsteps of them. *Credat Judæus Apella.*

But, first, Did they draw the Nonconformists into this Conspiracy too? Those good Men were concern'd for their own sakes well to weigh such Reasons (if such there had been) as convinc'd the Lords of the Equity of that Sense, that they themselves were inclin'd to suppose the Declaration had. And if they could not have been convinc'd by them, they would have told us, how to answer them, and have shew'd us wherein they were inconclusive; but now for 40 Years and more there is a profound Silence in this Matter.

And then for the Conformists, whom he would suppose combin'd craftily to let the
Sense

of Ministerial Conformity. 41

Sense of *Fulwood* and the Rest pass for genuine, by suppressing the *Commons Reasons*, that they might draw in us; he has utterly forgot a Principle, that when it was for his Turn, he laid down, *viz.* That those High Men were so far from such a cunning Contrivance to *bring us in*, that they were rather desirous to have *kept us out*. He tells us, *Mod. Non. part 2. p. 105. That this was the firm Perswasion of them that had the Power, that such Persons, as were against the imposing things indifferent, and for the bare using them, &c. were better out of the Church, than in it.* Would they then have made such a strange Attempt, as to stifle the *Commons Reasons*, to let *Fulwood's* Sense pass, on purpose to bring them in, that they were firmly perswaded were *better out than in*. Indeed we are not so uncharitable to speak as he does, concerning those indefinitely *that had the Power*; but we fear, some such there were; Yet have none of these cross Men produc'd the *Commons Reasons* in *Anger* against *Fulwood's* and *Falkner's* Sense; nor have any of better Temper produc'd them out of good Will, to draw others to the Opinion they espoused, as is natural for Men to do. If then *Reasons* suppos'd to be of so general Concern do no where appear, it is even morally impossible, they should have been so

publickly

publickly debated; and consequently, that the Lords should have been convinc'd thereby; and therefore that the Clause was not drop'd by the Lords upon any such Conviction; which was the Thing that was to be proved.

We proceed now to the Passages excepted against in the Liturgy.

I. The first is of the *Salvation and Regeneration of Infants baptiz'd*. But this Head, he saith, doth not need many Words; And why then should we make any more Discourse about it? We under-

Of the Salvation and Regeneration of Infants baptiz'd.

stand this of such *Infants*, as do belong to God's Covenant, and have a Right to Baptism, and we can't imagin, that the Church should understand it, or that we ought to understand it of any other. And Mr. Calamy does not at all disprove our Sense, or prove that we ought to take it in any other Sense. And he grants and agrees with us, that such dying, without actual violating the Covenant, are saved. And that Baptism is a Sign of Regeneration or the New-birth. He saith, He is clear with us in. And he does not oppose the taking the Passages objected against in the Offices in that sacramental Sense. And what have we then here more to dispute about? Why, he thinks, it can't become one concern'd for Reformation.

of Ministerial Conformity. 43

to justify an Expression, that tempts Multitudes to fancy, that it is clear, by the Word of God, that Infants are certainly sav'd, if they are but baptiz'd. Why, what would he have us to do? Here is an Expression, that hath a sound and very true Sense belonging to it; and we cannot, we ought not to take it in any other Sense: And why may we not explain that Sense then? And why may we not justify it so explain'd? Or why is this inconsistent with a Concern for Reformation? What if some People fancy an odd Sense in it, and we go about to prevent their Misconstruction of it? Doth not this shew we are concern'd for Reformation? Yes, and we would be glad to have the Rubrick more explain'd or unexceptionably express, or quite taken away, for the sake of those that scruple it; though at the same time we are abundantly satisfied of the true Intent and Meaning of it. We would let Mr. Calamy know, we are for Reformation as well as he; we desire it, we long after it. But in the mean time, May we not subscribe (supposing this Rubrick were to be subscribed) to a good and sound Proposition, as we do and must understand it? And may we not defend it, when we have done, because some People misunderstand it? We can't tell what Mr. Calamy means by such Discourse. And yet
if

if the Point were as doubtful as he would suppose, we have told Mr. Calamy, and prov'd it, that neither is our *Subscription* or *Declaration* concern'd in it: it being a *Proposition* in a *Rubrick*, and not a Part of any *Office* to be used by us.

He hath the same Exception as before, against the Passages about *Regeneration* in the *Office of Baptism*, because it tempts Men to think, that no further *Regeneration* is needful. Well, and we are as free as he, to have those Expressions changed, or further explain'd, to prevent any such Abuse or Misconstruction of them; if any such there be, as possibly there may. But yet Mr. Calamy does not now contend with us, but that these Expressions may be understood likewise in a very sound Sense, in which we all agree: And why then, May we not subscribe them, and assent to the *Use of them* in that Sense, and when we are no way bound to do it in any other? And is it not evident, that we do not use them as applicable to all, but only to those to whom we think the *Office* it self belongs, viz. such as are *Church-Members*, to all whom the many *Scriptures* that we quoted in our 2d. Defence apply these and the like Expressions; and Mr. Calamy is not able to shew in any one Instance that we have miscited any *Scripture*, or apply'd it in any wrong

Meaning

Meaning or Manner. How then do we ~~un~~ teach any thing that we should teach, when we use these Expressions only, as they may be us'd, and as the *Scripture useth* them? And why must we bear the Blame of every accidental Mischief, that may ensue upon the Abuse and Misconstruction thereof, and not from the *Nature of the thing* in its true and right Sense; especially when we take all possible Care, upon proper Occasions, to prevent the Misunderstanding or Misuse thereof? Mr. Calamy forceth us to use more Words than we need to do in this Matter, by such hard Insinuations.

2. The next Head is, of the Use of Godfathers and Godmothers in Baptism. Upon this he is more large. He pretends to shew the Difference between Godfathers in other Churches and in ours; because they do not make the Declaration of the Covenant to which the Child stands bound amongst them, as they do amongst us: He saith, that *that which they cast on Godfathers was not to covenant for the Children*: neither do we cast any such thing upon them; nor did we bring it to prove a Parallel in any such thing: but that which we brought in the Comparison for, is, that if they do not exclude the Parents from their Right, then neither do we; for as to that

Of Godfathers
and Godmo-
thers.

that the Agreement holds, and this is all we brought it for. It is true, He denies it, and saith, *Letter p. 320. How Bishop Morley could say, that in the Church of England, Parents are not forbidden to present their Children to Baptism, when the Canons so plainly forbid it, he cannot imagin.* To which we reply, that nevertheless Bishop Morley did say it, and he was one of the Great Impassers; and knew the Mind of the rest as much as any Man; even the very Man in the Secret; and this Man asserts, that the Parents are not excluded. And now that the Canon forbids it, and plainly forbids it, is one of those things that we want a Name for. It does not indeed suffer them to be Godfathers (for theirs is a distinct Province). And it saith, that the Fathers shall not be urg'd to be present, as if their Presence were of Necessity, that without it the Children could not be baptized (for so it is not). But it does not forbid them to present their Children to Baptism, as Bishop Morley expresseth it; but they are bound to do so, by desiring the Ministers to baptize their Children, *employing* the Godfathers to represent their Children in the Administration of the Ordinance; and by the inward Acts of Faith and Prayer to dedicate their Children to God therein.

As to Godfathers becoming Covenanting

Sponsors,

Sponsors, (as he expresseth it) he does renew his Accusations against them, as if they were intended to bind the Children, and to secure the Blessings for them. But this we deny'd to be done in our Office, and so do still: and to our large Discourse thereof, and our Proof from Private Baptism, in which the Children are bound to the Duties, and the Blessings are seal'd to them, without God-fathers; that therefore they are not brought for those Ends, or to do those things for the Children, but for other Ends by us at large. set down in our 1d. Defence; to all this, I say, we can pick out but two Things pretended as an Answer.

The one is, That supposing Sponsors were design'd for the Use he pretends, [he should have expressed it fully, to secure the Blessings of the Covenant, and bind to the Duties of it] yet, saith he, there would be no need of them in private Baptism, in Case of Sickness and Danger of Death. But this is gratis dictum with a Witness: for if this were the Use of Sureties to secure the Blessings of the Covenant to the Children (as the Course of his Argument should have run) then were there most need of them in Private Baptism, and in Danger of Death; because they stood in absolute need of those Blessings, upon their Entrance into an unchangeable State. If Godfathers were design'd

design'd (as his Charge is expressed, *Letter* p. 319.) to convey to Children the Gospel Blessings, they could least of all be spar'd in Danger of Death. But he will needs put a Sense upon the Churches Office, that is and hath been disown'd, and which we have fairly argu'd against, and can by no means see that ever it was intended as the End thereof; and then he quarrels against it. For Godfather according to him, must be for this and this Purpose, whether the Church will or no; and then he ridicules the Office upon his own groundless Supposition. We have produc'd from Dr. Burgess, That the Interrogatories in Baptism, made to, and answer'd by the Godfathers, are only an Adumbration of that Stipulation, which is really enter'd into by receiving the Sacrament of Baptism it self. And that this was approv'd as the Church's Sense by King James, the then Bishop of Winchester and the Archbishop. To which he answers, that however he does not see, that the doing of this in such a way, is either to be justify'd or accounted for. But whether it be to be justify'd or accounted for; whether the Matter design'd be expressed so well as it should be; or whether it might not be in another Manner better; that is not the Question, we shall discourse something of this presently: But the Question is, Whether the

not the *Sense of the Church*. We have pro-
 blec'd both Authorities and Reasons for it, which
 we cannot see but that they hold good, not-
 withstanding his Exceptions. And if this be
 the *Sense of the Church*, all the rest is a meer
 Quarrel about Words and Forms of speaking,
 which we shall never contend about, but wish
 rather that they might be chang'd, and made
 more inexceptionable, for the sake of those
 that are dissatisfy'd with these: When once
 the *Sense of the Office* is secur'd, the *wording*
 thereof is of much lesser Concern.

The other thing therefore we take notice
 of in his Answer, is a shameless *Comparison*
 between the *Responses* made in the Name of
St. the Child, and those made in the Name of the
Dead by the *Marcionites*. He saith, *The one*
is very near as odd as the other. And again,
it is much the same. Whereas the fundamen-
 tal Difference between the one and the other,
 is most apparent. The *dead Bodies* are not
 capable of *entring into Covenant* with God;
 and therefore to make a Declaration of a Co-
 venant between God and them, was wicked
 and absurd; but a *Child* is capable of being
entred into Covenant, and is actually brought
 in thereto, and therefore the *Covenant* may
 be declar'd both in the Lord's Name, and in
 the *Child's*, which is there by Baptism seal'd.
 And when he saith, *We are hard put to it,*
 E when

when we say that Children are bound by their own Promise and Covenant-Engagement, which their Sureties only declar'd; and that to found Infant-Baptism upon Promises or Covenant-Engagements of Infants, declar'd by their Sureties, is to betray it. It is plain, we do not found Infant-Baptism upon this Declaration for then there could be no Private Baptism without Sureties, if that were the Foundation of their being baptiz'd: But *Second Defence* pag. 145. we plainly declar'd the Foundation of Infant-Baptism to be, God's gracious Promise to Believers, and their Seed, by which he comprehends their Children in the Band of the Covenant; and a Capacity on their part to be brought into a Covenant-Engagement and Obligation, And this we say is actually done in Baptism; and our Meaning is there most plainly exprest, that the *Childrens Promise*, or Covenant-Obligation is declar'd by their Sureties which represent them there.

But it is that *one Response* especially, that he judgeth not proper, and does indeed ridicule, viz. That the Godfather should answer to the Question, *Wilt thou be baptiz'd* &c? in these Words, *That is my desire.* To which we reply; The End of Words is to be the Expressions and Signs of our Minds and the Determination of their Signification is by Custom and Agreement amongst Men

So that tho' there are various Uses of the same Words or Forms of Speech, yet when the Sense of our Words is determined by Custom, and they are not apt to deceive, or to be chang'd into any other Sense by the Hearers than what we intend, then do they answer all the Ends of Speech. To apply this; When Infants have a Claim to any Privilege amongst Men, Custom has determined that their Council or lawful Attornies do declare their Claim in Court; and they do it in the first Person thus; *I desire, or, We desire to be admitted* [suppose into some Copy-hold, or the like] the Sense is known and determined, that they by that Form of Words desire, that the Child should be admitted. So here, the plain Meaning thereof is (saith Dr. Falkner lib. Eccl. pag. 279.) to express that the Intent of the Child's being present, is to receive Baptism, which upon its Account, and in its Right and Name, they desire for it. And these Words, by Custom amongst Men for many Ages, being significant of our Minds, are not apt to deceive, nor is there likely to be any Damage thereby through Mistake of their Meaning: They are indeed a Metonymie, but not like Mr Calamy's Hyperbole, before-spoken of, in his 10th Chapter, that none, that we know of, ever guess'd to be so meant, till he told us so two years after. The Sense of these

Words is so plain and *determined*, that the meanest Countryman knows that he does thereby *desire Baptism* for the *Child*: And Mr. Calamy cannot so much as insinuate any wrong Sense, or other Sense, that any could be apt to put upon them. St. *Augustine* wrote part of his 23 *Epist.* on this Question, *Quomodo Susceptores in Baptismo respondeant, illos credere cum parvuli reverà non credant, & incertum sit, an sint credituri?* We know he will presently reject the Authority of the *Fathers*, but this he cannot withstand, that here is sufficient time from St. *Augustine's* days for Custom to make the Words significant of what is intended thereby; if Men will contend (it is that *Father's* Similitude in the above-cited *Epistle*) that we do not speak properly, when upon a *Lord's-day*, we say *This Day our Lord arose from the Dead*, where as he arose many years ago, he would object [*inaptè*] foolishly, seeing our Words are not apt to deceive, but are fully understood by the Hearers; I only add, as he also does in that *Epistle*; *Respondi sicut existimo, quantum attinet ad minus capaces, & ad contentiosos non satis; quantum ad pacatos & intelligentes, plus forte quam sat est.*

As to the *Abuses* caus'd by wicked and careless *Godfathers*, we declar'd against them and said, That the same *Abuses* might be

of Ministerial Conformity. 53

where there be no Godfathers; wicked Parents would be wicked and unnatural to their Children, &c. *Second Defence* p. 157. This he denies, and saith, *Letter* p. 323. We have no such Abuses amongst us Dissenters, who admit no Godfathers. To which we only say, Amen. We wish from our Hearts he could prove it.

3. We come next to the *exclusive Terms of Communion*. We had told him, that they respect all Determinations of Circumstances in Worship, which others scruple. As to his own Instances of the *Forms of singing, some sort of Officers, &c.* in the Dissenting Churches, he had by way of *Prolepsis* insinuated, That in such Cases they had the *Liberty of repairing to other Churches*, which, in Case of *National Impositions*, could not be granted. We had also reply'd, That this Answer could hold only as to *great Cities*, where there are many dissenting Churches; and not as to Places, where there are no other dissenting Congregations within *many Miles*: And we might add, if they go those many Miles, they may find the *same Determinations* (suppose, of the scrupled *Form of Singing, &c.*) and then they are likely to be debarr'd accidentally by such *Exclusive Terms* amongst them, as

Of exclusive
Terms of
Communion,
with respect
to Baptism.

well as amongst us. He can now add no further Answer than this *Letter*, p. 325. that the scrupulous Person *has the Liberty of removing his Habitation*, which he can have no Benefit by, in Case of a *National Constitution*. Whereas in hundreds of Cases, it would be as much Ruine for *some scrupulous Persons* to remove their Dwellings, upon which their Trade and Livelihood depends, to far distant Habitations in other Towns; as it would be for *others* to remove, beyond the Bounds of a National Church, into another Land.

What he saith further on this Head, is, That he cannot discern this, and he cannot discern that. *He cannot discern that our Constitution gives a Man Liberty to use the Form of private Baptism, when Persons scruple God-fathers.* What have we here to answer? There is no Reply to be made to his *not discerning*. He saith, *when the Diocesan gives Allowance to baptize a Child privately, he agreeth it may be justify'd, though Sureties are omitted: but that it is otherwise allowable, he cannot discern.* But could the Diocesan give this Allowance, if the Constitution did not allow it? If it may be *justify'd* by the Allowance of the Diocesan, it may be *justify'd* by the Allowance of the Law, which the Diocesan is no more allowed to dispence with than any Private Minister. When an Application

of Ministerial Conformity. 55

is made to a *Bishop* in such a Case, it is to obtain his Direction and Judgment, what the Intent of the Law may be; not to get a *Dispensation* from him contrary to the Law. If the Law it self be contrary, it is not his Allowance will justify the Act. This Concession of Mr. Calamy doth in all Reason make for the Concession of the Law it self in such a Case.

As to the baptizing Children therefore privately, whose Parents scruple some Rites, we still affirm, that we are fully empowered by the *Rubrick* so to do. He saith again, No; because the *Rubrick* confines us to Children that are Sick and in Danger of Death, without pretending to answer the plain Proof that we brought to the contrary: yet does he urge something new to prove such a Confinement; which is a late Representation of the Lower House of Convocation; wherein they say, that the unjustifiable Use of Private Baptism has lessen'd the Reverence due to that Holy Office, occasioned the mutilating the Form, &c. This Authority he several times refers us to. We will not question the Authority of this Representation, nor repeat what Bp. Burnet saith of it, in his Charge, at his Triennial Visitation, A. 1704. p. 10. But we will suppose it made by that whole House, and to have with it the Concurrence of the Bishops,

and to have then the *Royal Assent*, and, to please Mr. Calamy, a new *Act of Parliament* to back it, and even then it would not in the least oppose our Assertion. They declare against the *unjustifiable use of Private Baptism* (as it is well known there is great Occasion for Complaints) But do they say, that there is no Reason *justifiable* for Private Baptism but *Sickness and Danger of Death*? Or do they so much as insinuate any such thing? They know, and we have prov'd that there are divers other justifiable Reasons for it, *2d. Def. p. 167.* to which agrees a Passage in Bp. Burnet's *Charge* before-named, p. 11. *In Baptism, we ought not to comply with the Vanity of those, who desire to baptize in their Houses, as a Mark of Distinction; but we ought to consider Distance, and a hard Season; chiefly where Danger may be apprehended to the Child; for in those Cases, God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.* Here are other Reasons for *Private Baptism* besides *Sickness and Danger of Death*; and we are to consider them, as being indeed the sole Judges of the *urgent Cause* mention'd in the *Rubrick*. And doth the *Representation* say, that the Reason by us alledged for *Private Baptism*, is not a *justifiable* one? But perhaps he will say, they count the *Form mutilated*, if the Child be not afterwards brought to Church with

with Godfathers, &c. Well and good, but what if the Parents that scruple these Rituals, refuse to bring their Children to Church, (knowing that they are declar'd to be *fully and sufficiently baptiz'd*) and do not think it *expedient* for them so to do (though the Church does) Can we *compel* them so to do? No, by no Means; which is what we said before in this Matter, to which we refer the Reader, and desire him to judge between us.

4. As to the *Sign of the Cross*, He saith again, *He will not say it is simply unlawful*, yet in a few flouting Words he continues his Charge against it, as if it were unlawful; so that it is hard to know where to find him. If, saith he, *the Sign of the Cross be a Sign of Christ's Merits*, he should be hard put to it to conceive, to what Purpose the Sign of those Merits should, under that Notion, be apply'd to one that had not the thing signify'd secur'd [and convey'd, as he presently after adds] if there were a due Disposition of the Recipient. Under what Notion does he mean, that this Sign is us'd by us? Under the Notion of Christ's Merits offer'd to us, or under the Notion of Christ's Merits gloried in by us? nothing is more evident than that the latter is meant by our Use, and not the former. And what Relation is there between a Sign

Of the Use
of the Sign of
the Cross.

a Sign of Christ's Merits, or Christ crucify'd, glorify'd in by us (which is our Act and Deed) and the securing and conveying those Merits (which is only God's Work) where there is a *Disposition in the Recipient*? A Recipient suppoeth an Offer of something to be receiv'd, so it is in the Sacraments; And if a *Humane Sacrament* be made (as amongst the Papists) something is suppos'd to be therein offer'd, and so thereby convey'd and secur'd: which Supposition, we prove against them, to be highly evil and affronting; because we can no more appoint what *Signs God* should convey and secure his Grace and the Merits of his Son by, than we can our selves convey and secure them. But the *Glorying in Christ's Merits* is our Work, and the *Signs* thereof belong to us, by Words and Actions. And so the *Primitive Christians* us'd this Sign; nor had they any other Sense of it that ever we heard of: To be sure the Meaning of it is ascertain'd amongst us, because it is always exprest in the Use of it, in token that the Baptiz'd shall not be asham'd, &c. He again mentions *Hooker* and *Comber*, without any regard to our Answer, and our References to *Dr. Whitby* for a yet larger one. As for *Bp. Taylor*, he was a most uncertain Writer, and saith as much against *Infant-Baptism* as against this Rite. For Answer to him, we refer

of Ministerial Conformity. 39

refer to the large *Scripture Warrant* for the Use of such Signs in our 1^d. Def. p. 49, &c. to *Bishop King's Appendix* to his *Admonition* (which is the plainest Book we ever saw upon this Subject, highly worth perusal) and shall content our selves with a Quotation out of *Bishop Burnet's Sermon* since the writing our last Defence, which is join'd to his Charge, A. 1704. in p. 44. Having spoken of the *Prejudices* against *Kneeling* at the Lord's-Supper, He adds, *That against the Cross in Baptism is as weak, that because Papists use the Cross as a sort of a Charm, and fancy there is a Divine Virtue accompanying, therefore we, by using it, comply with that Superstition, and fortify it. They use the Cross before Baptism, as an Exorcism to drive away the evil Spirit; and this supposeth a divine Power accompanying a humane Institution, which makes it to be of the Nature of a Sacrament. Whereas we use it after Baptism, not as having any Virtue ty'd to it, but only as a Declaration of the Faith we profess; so that it is only a way of speaking by a Gesture or Action, and has nothing ascribed to it, that is in any sort sacramental. Thus far that Bishop. We shall only make a little Addition to the many parallel Signs, which we have clear'd up this Matter by in our former Books. Mr. Calamy hath lately put forth a new Edition of an excellent Book of*
one

one of the ejected Ministers; in that, is the Form of covenanting with God, which hath been of Use, we believe, to many hundreds of Souls; after which are these Words. *This Covenant I advise you to make, not only in Heart but in Word; not only in Word but in Writing; and that you would with all possible Reverence spread the Writing before the Lord, as if you would present it to him as your Act and Deed. And when you have done this, set your Hand to it. Keep it as a Memorial of the solemn Transactions that have passed between God and you, that you may have Recourse to it in Doubts and Temptations.* Here we have,

1. Not one dedicating Sign only, but several; here is Christ crucify'd accepted and closed with upon Terms there mention'd, and the Signs are, *writing down the Form; then spreading it before the Lord, as presenting the Writing to God, as the Covenanters Act and Deed.* Then after that, is the *putting the Hand to it.*

2. The exciting Signification, &c. afterwards, which is express'd by *keeping it for a Memorial, having Recourse to it in Doubts and Temptations.* Let this be compar'd with what Mr. Hooker and Dr. Comber say of the Sign in Controversy. We mention these things so distinctly, because it has been

of great Service to remove the Prejudices against this Sign, to observe how familiarly and with what Profit many other Signs of the like Nature have been, and are still used by us.

5. In speaking to the *excluding them that do not kneel* from the Lord's-Supper, amongst other things which we largely insisted on, and to which he gives no Answer, We prov'd from Bishop Morley, that the *Rubrick* does not exclude them. That Bishop expressly saith, that Mr. Baxter's *Argument* (which Mr. Calamy has taken up) *was deny'd as belonging to the Canons and not to the Common-Prayer*. Now to answer us, he also quotes Bp. Morley, who, he tells us, saith, that *our Law admits not such as do not kneel*, and gives this Reason; *because they break the Orders of the Church*. And then he *brags* that we are condemned by Bp. Morley, whom we quoted. For our parts, we think it not worth the while to look, whether Bp. Morley saith so or no; for it no ways affects what we cited from him. No doubt the *Orders of the Church* require *Kneeling*, and that the *Canon-Law* excludes them that do not. But Bp. Morley tells us (contrary to what he had asserted of the *Men or Man in the secret*) that the *Liturgie* does

Of excluding from the Lord's-Supper those that dare not kneel.

does not exclude them, tho' the Canon does so that by his Leave we are far from being condemned by Bp. Morley, to whom we appeal'd. Then he flies out; *Let the Hardship arise from the Canon or the Liturgy, it is much at one to Him; if the Canon be not a part of the Liturgy, it is a part of the Constitution, &c.* But hold, Sir, it is not much at one to us, if it be to you. For if this Exclusion of them, that do not kneel, had been by the Liturgy, then had we been required to Assent and Consent to it (as your Charge runs) But if it be only by the Canon, (to which we are not call'd to give our Assent and Consent) then, according to your self, we are not obliged to it, till it becomes the Command of our particular Bishop; nor then neither, unless in that Particular in which he commands it, we judge it to be lawful and honest. Pray, Sir, Why so hard to receive a plain Answer?

But, saith Mr. Calamy, *If they who afterwards made sundry Alterations and Amendments, had not intended that the Rubrick should be interpreted by the Canon, they would have altered the Rubrick. But they having not done this, it is plain, that it was design'd, such as would not kneel should be excluded.* Now this is no Consequence at all. Supposing that they were never so much for obliging the Minister

to give the Sacrament to none but those that kneel, (as perhaps some of them were) and that they who would not kneel should be excluded; yet it does not follow that they thought the *Rubrick* did oblige them to exclude them; But it was the *Canon* which they depended upon, which had a *Penalty* annexed thereunto, and which the *Governours* might make use of, as they saw good, in their *Administration*; the *Rubrick* in the mean time laying no such Obligation upon them. If they had not intended this Exclusion indeed, they might have vacated the *Canon* which obliged to it: but their Intention of the Continuances of this Exclusion, is no Argument of their Intention that the *Rubrick* should be interpreted (as he calls it, or rather enlarged) by the *Canon*) it was sufficient that the *Canon* it self did require it, though the *Rubrick* did not do it. But whether it be Prudence in a Minister, that does not think this *Canon* will excuse him before God in doing what is there enjoyn'd, to run upon the *Canon's* Mouth, as Mr. Calamy's Wit, is another Matter of Dispute; and belongs to another place, in which it is professedly treated of. Prudence requires the comparing a great many Circumstances together, and then making a Determination accordingly; it is sufficient for our present Purpose, that it is not that which

which comes within our *Subscription* or *Declaration* of Assent and Consent.

6. We came next to the *Three Orders of Ministers*. Mr. Calamy insinuates, as if we thought

our selves not obliged to own them. Whereas we say, that our *Assent* and

Consent respects not that *Rubrick*, which saith, *There were always such since the Apostles times*.

We do indeed believe there have been *Three* such Orders in the Church of Christ all along at least, in some particular Churches where they have been all needed; but we are not called to give our *Assent* and *Consent* thereunto, or to the Nature of their *Distinction* and *Powers*; but to the *Form* of the *Ordination* of those that are called to those *Three Orders* amongst us, and that *that* may lawfully be used. And how are we out in this, unless he could prove that it was contained in our *Declaration*, which he does not go about to do; and we have sufficiently prov'd the contrary? He saith, Mr. Baxter was for *Archbishops* above *Bishops*, but not for *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, that had but part of the *Pastoral Power*. And yet he is not for disputing about *Words* and *Phrases*. We assent that the *Presbyters* of the Church of England have the *Pastoral Power* that Christ left them; and we shew'd him that Mr. Baxter asserted the same

Def. p. 110. So that those whom Mr. Baxter calls *Bishops*, we call *Presbyters*; and whom he calls *Archbishops*, we call *Bishops*; though Mr. Baxter frequently useth the same Phrases that we do. But how lean an Answer is this to our Defence?

7. About the Office of Burial, Mr. Calamy saith, *He can say no more than what he has said, and we have done with it too.* But he has again recourse to the Canon; which we allow in those Instances as to which it is lawfully apply'd in the Administration of the Government; but if wrongfully apply'd, (as all human Laws are capable of being) it is that wrong Application no part of the Constitution; nor are we more concern'd therein, in Point of Conscience, than he is. We give our Assent to the Office, and to the Use of it, where it may be used; and that is all. We give no Assent to the Canon, though in those Instances in which it is rightly apply'd, we do not censure it neither. And if it should fall out, that we should incur any Danger thereby, it is not any Impediment of our Conformity, but a meer Hardship, that may fall out in any Government. Mr. Calamy saith here, *We have not sufficiently answer'd his Story.* Let the Reader judge. We are apt to think, if he had had us at any Advantage, he

Of the Office
of Burial.

F. d. m. d. c. x. would

a Calendar

would not have past it so. We are not so
encouraging *Presumption* thereby, nor do we
think that we do do it. But as *addes* *Defence*
der of the Church, as he takes me to be, there
is more in our Discourse about this matter
than he thinks fit to answer. And so we must
leave it.

Of the Rule
to find out
Easter.

8. Concerning the Rule to find
out Easter-day; we asserted that
our Assent and Consent concern
it not; and he never offers to
disprove it; but we are nevertheless very
clear in its being a good Rule, when rightly
understood. And we think we made it
clear in our *Second Defence* p. 214. &c. that
very School-Boy might understand it; and he
does not offer a one Word of Reply; but said
Letter p. 324. *When we have taken never*
much Pains to help People to understand the
Rule, it is so but sometimes it is not so always
We wonder at him; he cannot forbear saying
something, though it be nothing to the pur-
pose. The Rule must hold always; and exactly
answer to Easter-day; because Easter-day is
every Year according to that Rule; only
the Computation of new and full Moon
four or five days later than they are in the
Heavens; as in our first Month 11 days later.
See Dr. Wallis's *Discourse of the Sabbath* p. 12.
The 14th day of the first Month (so call'd
Exod 12. 6. *Ezra* 6. 19.) is quite different
from

from March 14. which is the 14th Day of the first Month in our Almanacks. We say the Queen came to the Crown the 8th of March, tho' according to the more exact account, call'd *new Style*, it was 11 Days sooner, viz. Feb. 25. Yet we speak properly, when we go according to our common Computation: In like manner we speak properly when we fix *Easter* according to the Computation, of new and full Moons, always us'd in that Matter, and set down expressly in the Book, where the Rule lies.

9. We come to the *Apocryphal Lessons*. We had said formerly, *Of the Apocryphal Lessons*, that it is common for the lesser and meaner to go under the Name of the greater and better part: this was because the Calendar, that has in it some *Apocryphal Lessons*, bears the general Title of the *Order of Holy Scriptures*. This we speak by the Bye in 1 *Def.* p. 72. And now he tells us, that this is to allow the *Apocryphal Lessons* to be styl'd *Holy Scriptures*. Whereby we meant, that when a Book, or any thing else, contains Matter of divers kinds, the one large and principal, the other small and mean; it is frequent that the meaner or smaller part contain'd does lose its Name, and the whole Book or Thing containing is call'd by the Name of the Principal part contained therein. We have a Book containing

a *Calendar* and a *Collection of Prayers*, we call this the *Common-Prayer*. Is it not absurd to say the *Calendar* is a *Prayer*, or goes under the *Name of a Prayer*, because the whole Book is so styl'd? That, being a smaller and meaner Part, loseth its proper Name in the general Title, which is only taken from the Principal Part. So here in the *Calendar Title*, the *Apocrypha* loseth its Name, the whole being denominatèd from the greater and better Part, viz. the *Holy Scriptures*. And it is as absurd to prove from thence, that we style the *Apocrypha* the *Holy Scriptures*; as it would be to prove that the *Calendar* is styl'd a *Prayer*, because that is the Title of the Book that contains it. Here he saith, we talk upon this Head as if our Church were infallible, and that we ought rather to own a Slip, than to talk after this loose Rate. But why doth he not shew us, that the Rate that we talk at is so very loose; or that we think our Church is infallible, because we vindicate what may be vindicated in her? Can't we give a fair Account of her Injunctions, but we must presently hold her to be infallible?

But he saith, p. 336. He is not far justling out any part of the canonical Scriptures, to give way for the *Apocryphal*. This we fully answer'd 2 Def. p. 224, 225. and he will

not reply but by Repetitions. And to talk of rather reading the same Books over again, &c. to us, is very strange, who it may be read more of the Canonical Scriptures in one of our Churches in one Year, than he does in Three (to speak modestly).

Then comes a very odd Passage in the same p. 336. He saith to me, *If you can't see a Difference between the Churches reading Apocryphal Books, i. e. allowing of the private Reading of them, and appointing them to be read in publick worshipping Assemblies, 'twould be a vain thing for one to argue with you, Not see a Difference, Man! I saw a plain and manifest Difference between them, and prov'd that the Article (which you subscribe) speaks of the latter, viz. of reading them in the Assemblies; and not of the former, viz. of private reading them; and you scorn to reply to me, or to speak to the Purpose. You are to subscribe to the publick Reading them as well as we, as we have plainly prov'd, and you are not able to disprove; And why do you quarrel with us for doing what you your self have done?*

The most plausible Passage is his Quotation from Bp. Burnet, who speaking of the Ancient Churches reading the Apocrypha, saith, *That by being usually read, they came to be reckoned amongst Canonical Scriptures.* Where-

upon Mr. Calamy adds, *This I think is a fair Warning.* But before he had intimated any such Danger amongst us, He should fairly have answer'd what we have largely said about this Matter, 2d. Def. p. 230, 231. But that is a Thing upon every Occasion he shews himself utterly negligent in.

Of the Old
Version of the
Psalms.

10. The next Head is about the old Version of the Psalms Concerning which, he saith speaking to me, p. 338. If you are contented to declare, that it contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, when you do not know but it may, &c. He here represents us as contented to declare, &c. when we expressly shew'd that no such thing is or can be required, 2 Def. p. 233, &c. That of there being nothing contrary to the Word of God respects our Subscription to the Book of Common-Prayer it self, as distinguish'd from the Psalter, and hath no Relation to the Psalter at all: and yet that Subscription too (as he elsewhere acknowledgeth) respects the Common-Prayer in its Offices and Prescriptions with respect to the Use, or that it may lawfully be us'd. And here he confounds the Subscription and Declaration together; and brings in the Words contain'd in the Subscription as contain'd in the Declaration; and makes the Declaration to contain in it those

Words, that are only contain'd in the Subscription; and then adds, that the Approving is distinctly express'd in the Assent and Consent. The Approving of what? The Approving of the Use of it is contain'd in the Declaration: and no other Approving is contain'd in the Subscription or Declaration, but of the Use. And sure, we may use a Translation, where we are not certain that every Word is agreeable to the Original, which is what he means, that we do not know but here may be something in this contrary to the Word of God, or to the Original Hebrew; which is true also of the other Translation. We may unseign'dly approve of the Use of a Version, in which we do not know but there may be some Mis-translations, or we must approve of none. Unless he would run up our Approbation, to the highest Commendation and Justification, &c. again, which we think, after so plain a Confession of its being an Hyperbole, he cannot offer to do. We are far from believing that this Version is without Faults; the Church owns it has such by substituting a better Translation in our ordinary Bibles; though she has thought fit to continue this in the Use of the Church, where it may be sung or said according to the Points therein; and we agree that it may be lawfully used.

Of the Dam-
natory Sen-
tences.

II. His Discourse on the *Athanasian Creed* is wholly defensive in Vindication of his own Subscription to the 8th of the xxxix *Articles*; and there are two Passages in it very remarkable.

The one is, upon his referring to Mr. Baxter's Explication of that *Article*, wherein he declares for this *Creed*, if one part of it may be explain'd, and the *damnatory Sentences* excluded: saith Mr. Calamy, p. 338. As long as his Sense was declar'd (viz. in Mr. Baxter's Pamphlet) before his Subscription, he sees not, but that he may be satisfy'd. And p. 339. So long as the *Justices* that are empower'd to take our Subscriptions will allow us to give in the Sense, in which we subscribe, before hand, we are safe. To this we say, that we have grounds to believe that the *Body* of the *Non-conformist Ministers* in *London*, soon after the *Act of Toleration*, did subscribe without giving in any Explication of the Sense; and this after a Consultation amongst themselves, and mutual Agreement so to do. Since this, Mr. Calamy does not say, that ever any did before-hand give in such an Explication of this *Article* to the *Justices*, and that they allowed it. It seems very unlikely that *Gentlemen* should take upon them to judge of the Sense of *Doctrinal Articles*

Articles in dubious Points; or that they should think themselves empower'd to allow the denying any, doctrinal Point, as this is which the damnatory Sentences contain, and which he would have to be excluded. The Subscribers must satisfy themselves about what is required: it is not the Justices Business to give or take their Sense. They are to subscribe in the Sense of the Law, which the Justices are to see them do: they are not to be the Interpreters of the Law, but to execute it.

However, we are certain, no such thing can ordinarily, if ever, be done in the Countries: In many Places the Justices do but unwillingly receive the Subscriptions of the Dissenters; Some Chairmen would rather require more of them than less. So that this Method, if practicable in London, would but be to cast Scruples into the Minds of his Brethren in the Countries, who cannot have the Dispensation, that he pretends to have. But now, What will he say to us upon this? Why, p. 339. Had you, saith he, but given your Sense of Assent and Consent, and the other Terms of Conformity, as you now do, and been admitted in that Sense, I should not think you would have had any Reason to regard the Reflections of any Man. Why so, Sir? If this had been done, yet might your Reflections have

have hindred our Ministry, and prejudic'd Persons against us, as it actually did, till we fairly vindicated our selves, and brought the Matter to that Evidence, that (blessed be God) it is come to. And you would still have argu'd with us, that what we had done had not been *justifiable* notwithstanding, as you do in the Case of the *Interrogatories in Baptism*, and other Things, in so solemn a way given in by Dr. Burgess, and accepted as the true Sense and Intention of the Church. But, Good Sir, was not our Sense, of these Things declar'd before our Conformity, by others, as, you say, yours was by Mr. Baxter? and you told us, that the high Men were willing to have it so, to draw us in; though in Contradiction to what you say in another place, that they would fain keep us out. Yet we could not escape your *Reflections*. How many Ways will you wriggle and turn your self? Are not Fulwood's and Falkner's Books, who have declar'd for our Sense of Assent and Consent and other Terms of Conformity, more publickly taken Notice, than Mr. Baxter's two or three Sheets about the Articles? Does not Mr. Baxter say, he never knew a Conformist but understood the Assent and Consent with the Limitation? How many Bishops could we name him, that openly own our Sense? It were easie to enlarge upon this

Digression;

Digression ; but we only add, if we *had no Reason to regard his Reflections*, then he had no Reason to make them.

There is another Passage very remarkable under this Head. *What is the true Sense* (saith he) p. 339.) *and Intention of the Church of England in the Case*, (viz. about this Article which he is to subscribe) *is with him of small Moment.* Spoken like a *Man of Spirit* ! The *Articles are Church Articles* : and the Design of the *Nonconformists* subscribing them, is for the Security of the *Doctrine of the Church*, against any erroneous Persons, that might shelter themselves under their Name. The *Church* declares these Sentences *ought to be receiv'd*, and does *receive* them accordingly ; he subscribes the same, and declares also *they ought to be receiv'd* ; and yet the *Sense and Intention of the Church is with him of small Moment.* But saith he, speaking of himself and others, *We regard the Articles only as so many Positions, which the State requires us to own and subscribe, if we expect Liberty to dissent from the publick Constitution, without being molested.* But will this excuse him from subscribing them in the *Sense of the Church* ? Does he not think the State requires them in the *Sense* that the *Church* requires them ? Doth he think the *Sense of the State* is different from the *Sense* of

of the *Church*? And doth not the *State* require Subscription to them, meerly to secure the *Doctrine* of the *Church*? And if the *Sense* of the *Church* then, be the *Sense* of the *State*, then must he make the Subscription in the *Sense* of the *Church*, as well as we, if he deal fairly.

Of the Rubrick about Confirmation.

12. As to the Rubrick about Confirmation, we shew'd him that the being *desirous to be confirm'd*, and not obtaining it, suppos'd some Obstructions, that Men might meet with to hinder their actual Confirmation: and the Scruples about the Episcopal way were such an Obstruction. This he yeilded to once, and we were agreed upon the Matter, 2 Def. p. 244. Now without any new Arguments he renews the Accusation, and overlooks our Interpretation (which before he own'd did answer the Rubrick, and suit the way of Expression well enough. Mod. Nonc. p. 270. only that he might have something to say under every Head, though in Contradiction to what he had before granted. He intimates that Persons must be *desirous at least*, of Confirmation in the *Church* way, else he can't see that the *Church* allows of their being admitted to Communion. Now we think it is a fair Distinction that we us'd, between the Substance, and Circumstances of Confirmation. The Substance is, the taking upon them, and making

king a publick Profession of their owning the baptismal Covenant before the Congregation, and a partaking of the Publick Prayers for their Confirmation therein. The *Circumstances* are, the Persons administering, and the particular Rites and Form of the Office. If he be ready and desirous of Confirmation in the *Substance* of it, this qualifyeth him for the *Communion*. And the Church requireth no more, than what qualifyeth for the *Communion*. The *Scruples* about the *Circumstances* of the Administrator, and the Form of Management, can be no *Hindrance* to that *Qualification*; and therefore cannot in Reason be suppos'd to be intended by the Church as an *Hindrance* to the *Communion*. But 'tis the thing in it self, in the *Substance* of it, that we must have respect unto.

III. Having done with the several Things reflected upon in the Liturgy, we come now to the Oath of Canonical Obedience, which Mr. Calamy saith, he takes to be the most capital Article of our Debate; nay, in some respects, he saith, he reckons it rather more momentous. And according to his first Representation thereof in his *Abridgement*, we took it to be so our selves. But as he was pleas'd in his 2d *Thoughts* to represent it in his former Book, with those *Concessions* that he made there to us, and which he here saith, that
be

he stands to, we think that there is very little in it. And we cannot imagin, that his Discourse thereof can do him any Service; unless it be to make some unwary Readers, that only cursorily run over the Book, to think, that surely there must be something in the Matter, or else that such a Man as Mr. Calamy would never spend so many Words about it.

He begins again with the *History of the Oath*, and the *Popish Canons*, which we have reply'd to, and have plainly shew'd, that even in those Times *subscribing, or swearing to the Canons, or swearing not to do any thing against the Canons*, was quite a different thing from *swearing Obedience, or to be obedient to the Bishop*; that they were two Things of a very different Nature; that where the former was required, it was antecedent to the latter; and that the Obligation to *observe the Canons* was one thing, and that the *Oath to the Bishop* was another. And that with us, there is no such thing required as *Swearing to the Canons at all*, but only an *Oath to the Bishop*. If the Reader will be pleas'd to peruse his *History of this Matter*, and compare with it our *Reflections upon it*, we can venture him to pass his Judgment in the Case. Nor hath Mr. Calamy said any one thing that hath enervated or destroyed what we have sugge-

led on that Head. And whereas the Oath to the Bishop in the popish Times did run in an unlimited Manner, it is now by the Reformation limited to Things lawful and honest only; which makes the Oath also now quite a different thing from what it was then.

And we still say, that Mr. Calamy hath alter'd the State of the Question about this Oath, from what it was in his first Representation thereof. He asserted before, as he now tells us from Mr. Baxter, Letter p. 340. That it had reference to the stated Laws, or Canons of the Church; and carry'd in it a plain Obligation to comply with them, and submit to them in our stated Practice, where we had not a Dispensation. This we say, is swearing to the Canons in themselves, antecedently to any particular Command of a Bishop enforcing the same; and tho' he saith, he is not fond of our way of expressing it, yet he will not contend about it, but let it pass. According to this Representation of the Sense of the Oath, we are bound by it to the Canons, whether the Bishop insists upon what is requir'd in the Canons or no. Whereas our Oath is to our Bishop, and to his particular Commands, and that only in Things lawful and honest; and therefore not to the Canons themselves at all, nor not till they become the particular Commands of the Bishop, and then we must

must consider also whether what is required be lawful and honest or no. All this now Mr. Calamy grants upon second Thoughts, and gives us his Concessions, which he again repeats, p. 345. *That the Oath doth not straitly and in the Sight of God, oblige to obey such Canons, as upon farther Consideration we do not heartily approve, till we are call'd upon by the Bishop; nor even then such Canons, our Obedience to which, tho' it be required of us, we cannot upon strict Search find to be lawful and honest.* These we acknowledge are very fair and frank Concessions, and we desire no more. We have done, and the Controversie is at an end, if Mr. Calamy would let us alone. These Allowances, he saith, were what he should desire himself, if he were in our Case; and when he was particularly opening his own Sense in the Case, which he had not done before, he was willing to make them for us (and a little for himself too, for he needs them as much as we, with respect to another Oath that he has taken, but however) we accept of his Frankness therein, and thank him for it. But that which we admire at is, that he cannot see an Inconsistency between this Sense which he now saith is his own, and that of Mr. Baxter's, and that he still insists upon it, that Mr. Baxter's Sense is not contrary to his Allowances.

ances. If *that* was Mr. Baxter's Sense only, and *this* his own, we grant indeed that he does not contradict himself; but we cannot see, but that he contradicts Mr. Baxter, and his first Representation of the Oath in his 10th Chapter. If he can reconcile them, he may. We desire to deal fairly with him. We have not now to do with Mr. Baxter, whose Judgment in this matter we discours'd of, *Second Defence* p. 263. but with Mr. Calamy; and though we cannot agree with his Representation from Mr. Baxter, yet we do not see that Mr. Calamy and we are agreed in this matter. He saith now with some vehemency, *Letter* p. 352. *Did I ever give it as my Sense, that you were oblig'd to obey all the Canons, whether commanded, or no? I never so much as thought it, nor I believe, Mr. Baxter either: If I never said it, how do I now contradict my self?* What you thought, Sir; we cannot tell; nor what your Sense was, save only by your *Writings*; but indeed you did write so, and that very plainly in your 10th Chapter, as appears by what we cited from it just now, and as we shew'd, *Second Defence* p. 253, 275. and all your Readers, that we know of, understood you so. Indeed we grant Mr. Calamy came off from this in *Second Part of Mod. Non.* which is the thing we now take notice of. As the matter now

stands between us, granting the Limitation before-mention'd, he has spoken our very Hearts. And whether the Oath hath reference to the *Canons already made*, or to the *future Commands* of the Bishop, within the Compass of the Canons, or without; yet if the Limitation to things lawful and honest, doth belong to all the Obedience that is sworn by the Oath as he saith, p. 354. he falls in with us; we have as much as we desire, we are agreed and have done contending in this matter.

There is only one thing more therefore that we shall take notice of; and that is, to examine the *Distinction* which Mr. Calam gives us in this *Business*, and which he saith is a very plain one, and that for want of observing thereof we have made this woful pothel Letter p. 345. viz. That we must distinguish between the real obliging force of an Oath and the Intention of Man to bind us by it. And then he saith, That no Oath can oblige us to what we are convinc'd is not lawful and honest; and that this hath been his Sense as to this Oath in particular, ever since he consider'd it, p. 346. And then again he saith, p. 347. He owns our Oath cannot in the sight of God oblige us to what we are convinc'd is not lawful and honest. Now if he means no more than this, That this Oath cannot be to us *Vinculum iniquitatis*, then is it no more true

of this Oath, than of the *Jews Oath to kill Paul*,
 or the wickedest Oath in the World; and it
 would be true of this Oath, though it were the
 wickedest Oath that can be made, that we can-
 not be bound by it to any thing that is wicked;
 or that we think so, whilst we think so. For
 we must not think by our Oath that we can
 alter the Nature of things, or bind our selves
 to Disobedience to any just Law. And if we
 make such a wicked Oath, we are under an
 Obligation to break it; and it is our Duty to
 do so, and not Perjury, which is a Sin. And if
 this be all his Design, to save us from Per-
 jury, when we break it, we are but little
 oblig'd to him for this, and thank him for
 nothing. But we suppose, he must mean,
 That this Oath being taken only with re-
 spect to things *lawful and honest*, the Form
 of the Oath it self doth not oblige us to any
 more before God, however Man may intend
 or interpret it. This we take to be his Sense,
 because he *alloweth* the *Limitation* in it only
 to *such things*. So that we are not only, *not*
 oblig'd by it to any *unlawful* or wicked thing,
 but by his Allowances, every *thing* that we
 think *unlawful*, is *precluded* out of the Oath it
 self, which is only to obey in *lawful things*.
 And then we accept of the *former part* of the
Distinction, as home to our Business; where-
 by we are secur'd not only from Perjury in
 break-

breaking, but from Evil in making such a Oath. And this we take to be his Meaning again, because he imputes our taking the Oath, rather to *Imprudence*, than any thing else, p. 346.

But now as to the latter part of his *Distinction*, concerning the *Intention of Man to bind us by it*, we cannot imagine of what use it is or to what purpose it is brought in, with respect to the Oath in it self; though it should be something, with respect to our *Imprudence* in taking it. But what *Intention of Man* does he mean? We know of no *Intention of Man* in this Case, that ought to be considered by us, but what is the *Intention of the Law*, and is contain'd in the *Form of the Oath* it self viz. That we should obey our *Bishop in all lawful and honest things*. This is the *Intention of the Law*, and so ought to be interpreted to be the Sense of our *Superiours* in giving the Oath; for this is the *Sense of the Word* and all that they will bear, and all that possibly can be contained therein. And we have no other way to judge of the *Intention of Man*, but by the *Intention and Sense of the Oath*, in the *Form of Words*, in which it is express'd. If he means, that Man may make use of this Oath to intrap us by it, by commanding something that he may suppose we shall think unlawful, and so upon our Refu-

may have us at the *Catch* to prosecute and punish us: If this should be supposed, yet this cannot be the *Intention* of the *Law*, or of the *Oath* it self; for the *Oath* is enjoin'd alike to all the *Clergy*, according to the fair *Sense*, and is to be made to all the *Bishops* alike, by the *respective Ministers* that are under them; and is not to be interpreted by the *Intention* of this or that *Bishop* in particular, that may possibly have a *catching* or ensnaring *Design* for some particular purpose in the Administration thereof. Now we are considering only the *Lawfulness* of the *Oath* it self, and whether it may not be admitted by us, as a lawful Term of Conformity, which we may comply with: For this it is sufficient, to consider the bare *Form* of the *Oath* in it self, according to the *Limitations*, which Mr. Calamy allows; and consequently according to the *Intention of Man*, as far as the *Intention of Man* is the *Intention of the Law*: And thus the *second* part of his *Distinction* is the same with the *first*, and so his *Distinction* is without a *Difference*. We are not here considering the *Abuse* that the *Oath* may be put to; or the *Danger* we may be in of Prosecution upon it. This doth not respect the *Lawfulness*, but the *Prudence* of taking it. And we must tell him, that we could not think it prudent, when the *Liberty* of our publick

Ministry is concern'd, to refuse to submit to an Oath that we take to be lawful in it self; though we might apprehend that it is possible that there might be some remote Danger that we might come to be expos'd to, by the ensnaring Abuse thereof. But saith Mr. Calamy, *We may unwarily take an Oath, by which we may in general bind our selves to such Measures, as strictly pursu'd, might lead us into that which is neither lawful nor honest.* And pag. 347. he tells me, *I have made such a general Promise, as if it should be kept in all the particular Canons, in which the Bishop has Power to urge it upon me, would draw me into Sin.* But how does a general Promise to do things lawful and honest, necessarily draw a Man in any Particular to what is unlawful and dishonest? If a Bishop, by Virtue of my Oath which I have given to him (which is the general Promise that Mr. Calamy means) should require or command me to do that, which after the strictest Search I cannot apprehend to be lawful and honest, then, according to Mr. Calamy's Concession, *I am not obliged to it before God*; and how then by my Oath or Promise am I drawn into Sin? He tells us indeed, p. 348. we may be liable to be prosecuted, and cited into the Ecclesiastical Courts, and punished for disobeying any Canon, after being call'd on by the Bishop. But then

then he presently fetcheth us off himself; And yet I'll own, saith he, before God and your own Conscience, you are not obliged, unless you see the things to be lawful. So that Conscience is safe, which could not be, if we were drawn by our Oath into any Sin. And all this supposed and granted, we cannot for our lives see, but the taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience with us, is a very lawful Term of Conformity; and we are perswaded that Mr. Calamy must in his very Heart think so too, after all these Concessions that he hath made.

Well, but he saith, Letter p. 348. If we do not comply in things unlawful, we do not indeed violate our Oaths; but he thinks we run the hazard of being charg'd with the Breach of our Oaths by our Superiours, who thought they had us fast and sure: and even this grates upon a tender spirited Man, that he should be charged with breaking an Oath, which he cannot safely keep. And though our Consciences, he saith, may be satisfy'd, we should be apt to think that an unhappy Reflection, and it would grate upon us, if we thereupon quitted our Livings, &c. No doubt of it indeed, it would be thus with me, as well as Mr. Calamy; for I have Sense and Feeling as well he, and it may be, should be as little able to bear Hardship as he or any Man else; for I have not that strength of Spirit or Constitution,

that Mr. *Calamy* hath. But does any reasonable Man think that this is sufficient Reason against taking an Oath to our Governours, that it is barely possible, that some Persons may ignorantly or maliciously charge us with the breaking of it, though we are never so clear in our own Consciences about what we do in pursuance of it? They charg'd the ejected Ministers with Breach of their *Allegiance*, with *Sedition*, and even with *Rebellion*, for meeting in separate Congregations for the Worship of God. But Mr. *Calamy* does not think they were the worse for this Charge; or did they refuse thereupon to take the Oaths to the Government? But to answer more particularly, we say,

1. That we have no Reason to think that we shall be ever so charg'd by any; much less by our *Governours*, though we should be commanded any thing which we could not comply with. Surely our Bishops understand the Oath, and the *Limitations* thereof (having themselves been bound thereby, and still are so to their *Archbishop*) they know what *Allowances* to make for the Sense of those *Limitations*, as well as Mr. *Calamy*; and are much more inclin'd to make them, than we could suppose him to be. They know, that if they command any thing, which we judge not lawful, that our Oath does not bind us

to comply therewith; and therefore they will not *charge* us with the Breach thereof. But further.

2. If we should fall into such times again, as when *Bishop White* made that Visitation, concerning which he gives us the Story of *Mr. Rastrick's* Troubles; and if we should be *charg'd* by such a Man as *He* for this or any other Crime which our Consciences stand clear of; we should indeed think it hard, as no Suffering is in it self *joyous*, but *grievous*; but hope that we should patiently undergo it, and never think the worse of our Duty, because passionate Men might revile us in the performance of it.

And we see not but *Mr. Calamy* is liable to the same *Charge*, having taken his Oath of *Allegiance* to the *Queen*, upon his *Noncompliance* with any of her *Laws* (if any have but Ignorance or Malice enough to make it) thought his Conscience be never so clear in what he does.

To prevent the Parallel, as urg'd by us in our *First* and *Second* Defence. He is very eager to prove the *Canons* not confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*. He saith, he has read 25 *Hen. 8. c. 19.* and finds not that *Constitutions made by Convocations that have the King's Assent, are thereby allowed.* This respects the *Actings of future Convocations*; but he cannot deny, nor

nor does in the least go about to disprove, That *that Act* does expressly confirm all the former *Canons*, which are *not contrary to the Statutes, &c.* by a direct Clause therein, which contradicts the Assertion of his former Book, *Mod. Nonc. part 2. p. 229.* and proves that *they* at least are part of the *Queen's Laws*; That the *Canons of Convocations subsequent* to that *Act*, which have the *Royal Assent*, are also confirm'd by the *Act*, he endeavours to disprove: For our parts we are not zealous in the matter, nor does any thing of our *Defence* depend upon it. It was mention'd at first as an Illustration of that, which he has since so amply yielded to us. We will tell him plainly what sticks with us. The *Canons of 1603.* are avouch'd by the *Declaration* annext, to be confirm'd by that *Statute*, they still pass for *Law* in all parts of the Land, multitudes of Proceedings in many *Courts* depend thereupon: And we cannot suppose, that all the *Parliaments* since (even when they were so jealous of the *Canons of 1640.* because a material Circumstance in the manner of signing *them*, was omitted) should suffer this to be, if they did not believe them to have obtain'd the Force of a *Law*.

That the *Oath of Allegiance* is parallel to the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, he still denies,

nies, for this Reason; because he saith, *Letter p. 351. By the one he is only bound to defend and support the Queen's Person, Crown and Dignity, under the Direction of the Laws; whereas by the other, we are bound to the Canons in the minutest matters----* and are liable to the Law if we refuse Obedience, &c. Now this is trifling; for all Disobedience to the Laws is, in the Construction thereof, against the Peace of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, her Crown and Dignity, as all Indictments run. And her Mandates go forth in her proper Courts by her Officers in civil Affairs, as the others do in Ecclesiastical Affairs. And he is liable to the Law, if he refuseth Obedience in the minutest matters. Let him try the Parallel in the Instance of *Lent*, which we gave him according to his own Demands, *Second Defence p. 272.* and he will find it exactly to hold: but he wisely passeth it by.

How easily, if we follow his trifling way, might we say, That he must distinguish, in the Oath of Allegiance, between the real obliging Force of an Oath, and the Intention of Man to bind him by it? And might add, That if he defend the Queen's Person, Crown and Dignity, according to the Direction of the Laws, he doth not indeed violate his Oath, yet he runs the hazard of being charg'd with the Breach of his Oath by his Superiours. Then could

could we produce the Story of Mr. *Rosewell's* Trial, and Mr. *Baxter's* Trial, as he doth the Troubles of Mr. *Rastrick*, and say; *It grates upon a tender-spirited Man to be charg'd with the Breach of Allegiance, for a Religious Meeting, or a Practical Book; and though he may be satisfy'd, he may be apt to think it an unhappy Reflection, and it would grate upon him to be so charg'd, when he is deprived of his Liberty, and put in hazard of his Life.* This actually was the Case, when the *Lord Chief Justice* said to Mr. *Baxter*, *Richard, thou art an old Knave, thou hast written Books enough to fill a Cart, every one of them as full of Sedition, I might say, Treason, as an Egg is full of Meat, with more of such Stuff.* Yet Mr. *Calamy* owns that Mr. *Baxter* and the other ejected Ministers were as free to take the Oath of Allegiance, as any Men.

Of the Canons of 1603.

In speaking to the Canons of 1603. he has left out our long and fair Answer to his former Accusations, and he yet continues them without any Reply. He will mislead the Readers of his Book (unless well established, or well acquainted with his Way of Writing) who read it without comparing it with the Book, that he pretends to reply to. In our 2d. Defence p. 285, &c. "We distinguished of

"Canon

“*Canons* that do not *belong* to us ; and of them
 “that do *require something* of us. As to the
 “*latter*, we distinguished between them as
 “*in themselves generally* set down, and as they
 “may be *applied* to this or that *particular*
 “*Case* in the Administration of the Govern-
 “ment. In this particular Administration,
 “we shewed, That what is incident to all hu-
 “mane Laws, is also to these, *viz.* That they
 “may in *some Cases* be utterly *unlawful* ; and
 “in *other Cases* very *good* and *lawful* : And
 “that it was only in the *latter Case* that
 “we were obliged to them. We went over
 “the *Canons* hereupon, that he excepted a-
 “gainst ; and shew’d in what *particular Ca-*
 “*ses* they are *good* and *useful* ; and in what
 “*other Cases* and Misapplications they are
 “*unlawful*. This Discourse lasts for about six
 Leaves together. To all which he makes
 no Reply, but as if he had not understood a
 Word we said ; he saith to me, If *I will ex-*
 “*communicate the Depravers of the Liturgy*, he
 “cannot help it ; if *I will refuse those that re-*
 “*fuse to kneel at the Lord’s Supper*, be it to my
 “self, &c. with more such Stuff. This is
 strange dealing with us. Doth he not know,
 that Laws are capable of a *Right Application*,
 or of a *Misapplication*, in the Exercise of the
 Government ? And we are only concern’d
 therein, when in that *particular Case*, in which
 they

they are applied to us, they appear lawful and good. But he saith, p. 355. *That many of the Canons are so bad, that he should be very uneasie to take an Oath, by which he should cherish in any Man an Opinion, that it was in his Power to oblige him to Compliance with them.* Now we have examined the worst of the *Canons* that he could pick out (by which any thing can be required of us) and have shew'd him that there are *none* of them *bad* or *evil* in *some Cases* or *Applications*: and that *all of them* (and all other *Humane Laws* besides) may be *bad* or *evil* in *other Cases* and in *Misapplications*. And *Charity* doth oblige us to believe, that neither the *Bp. of London* (whose *Episcopalia* he mentions) nor any other *Bishop*, hath any such *Opinion*, that they can *oblige* any *Man* to any thing, but what the *Doer* thereof must account lawful for him to do. They have no *Pretence* to any *Power*, in the utmost *Stretch* of it, but to require *Obedience* in those *Instances*, in which those under them are perswaded of the *Lawfulness* thereof; or to exact the *Penalty* of the *Law* where they are not.

The last *Head* is about the *Ecclesiastical Courts*. We shew'd at large, how little *Danger* we are in of being *hamper'd* thereby. But if any *Danger* happen to us in the *Performance* of our

our Duty, it is but what All are liable to, and we are never to be the worse thought of on that account. To this he saith, p. 357. *For his part he'll never plead for a Constitution, that exposeth a conscientious Minister to Hardships, for his being conscientious.* It seems plain in other places, he would have no *settled Constitution* or Establishment. It is impossible any one should be so contrived by Man, but conscientious Persons may at some time or other be expos'd to Sufferings therein, through their own *Weaknesses*, the *Malice* of false Accusers, or *Male-Administration* of them that are in Power. He is ungrateful if he does not upon Occasion commend our *Civil Constitution*, yet may innocent Persons sometimes be expos'd to *Hardships* in all the several Courts of *Westminster-Hall*. Yet tho' we bless God that Things are so well as they are, we may and ought to desire a *Reformation* of what is amiss; and may desire an *Alteration* of such Rules or Laws in Church or State, as are found to be needless; or that have lost the Use they were intended for; or appear to have brought more Damage than Benefit to the Nation.

And thus having finish'd what we at first design'd in our *Defence*, we should now put an End to the *Reader's Trouble*, but that in looking over Mr. *Calamy's* third Part of
Mod.

Mod. Nonconf. in answer to Mr. *Hoadly*, to which his *Letter* is adjoyn'd, we find, p. 99. That he has advanced some other Prejudices, by very artful Insinuations, against our Conformity to the National Constitution; which may be apt to produce in unwary Readers a further ill Opinion of our Practice, which we think therefore had need to be remov'd for our further Vindication thereof. This, as it lyes in that place, is most properly Mr. *Hoadly's* Province, which we do not intend to take out of his Hand: but as it is an Attack upon all our Practice, we think our selves likewise concern'd therein, in pursuance of the same Design, in which we have been engaged. And we believe we are able to shew that Mr. *Calamy* has no more Advantages in his Way, to the End that he intends by these Suggestions, than we have in

Of the Advantages which Mr. *Calamy* pretends to have above us in his Ministry.

ours: and that we are as free from all those Prejudices, that he has insinuated, as he: and that the Matter may rather be turn'd upon him; and that we have some Advantages in our Way, that he hath not in his.

He saith, first, That he fixeth on the sacred Scriptures, as his sufficient Rule and Standard, without admitting any thing, in Doctrine, Worship, or Discipline, which is not thereby

thereby warranted. By which he artfully insinuates, that we do not so: for this is one Thing, in which he pretends his Advantage to lie. This his insinuated Charge we abhor, and we are as clear of as he; and declare that we admit nothing in any of these but what we believe to be warranted by Scripture; and that we believe that to be a compleat Rule, that these and all other our Thoughts, Words, and Actions are to be brought to, and judged by. And for the Matters in Question between us, we have shew'd him our Warrant, 2d Des. p. 47, to 53. and in other places.

He saith further, *He allows of no Imposition upon Conscience, nor Force of any sort to constrain it.* We suppose he means, except only by the Word of God. And we declare to him the same, that we allow no other *Impositions on Conscience*, than those which the Law of God makes; and that nothing short of God's Revealed Will can bind the Conscience of any. We teach no *Tradition of Man as a Doctrine from God*. We own that our *Governours* can bind our *Practice*; but that not immediately, but by Means of the Law of God, which requires us to obey them in lawful Things. But no Mortal can bind our *Consciences*, or lay an Obligation on them to believe, that any Thing

is

is in it self a Duty that God hath not made so by his Command; or that any thing is in it self a Sin, that God hath not made so by his Prohibition thereof.

He saith moreover, *He is subject to no Authority, which requires punctual Compliance with any thing, which he is not admitted to see the Reason of.* This he pretends another Advantage above us; and yet he is subject to the same Authority that we are, and hath sworn Allegiance to the same Government. And we know not that he is made a Member of the Legislative Body, or a Counsellor of State, or acquainted with all the Reasons of their Actings. But if he would distinguish between the Reasons of the Governours in commanding, and the Reasons of the Subjects in submitting; then we answer, that we are required to comply with nothing, any more than he, that we have not full Liberty to see the Reasons of our submitting to, before we submit. He adds, *He is allowed to judge for himself, what Mode of Worship is most eligible, and what is agreeable to Scripture; what is lawful, and what is expedient, and what otherwise; and to act with Freedom according to his Sentiments and Apprehensions.* And to insinuate that we do not thus, is, as he tells Mr. D--n, to say, that we have Horns and Hoofs, i. e. are Beasts and not Men: supposing still, that he doth not speak of the

Act of *Imposing*, which is the Governours Act, but of the Act of *Submitting*, which is ours. And so no Christian can act, but as he judgeth it lawful, and expedient, and most eligible, for such Reasons as do occur to him, and all Circumstances considered. And so through God's Grace and Assistance do we, and therefore are as free as he. And he is highly uncharitable, if he thinks otherwise of us. But both he and we are under the same Law of Submission to our Governours; and it is because we see *Reason* to submit to their Determinations in such things as are lawful, that therefore we submit.

He adds, *He is under no Oath or Bond to Superiours, that can hamper him in his Charge towards those that are his Charge.* And we have shew'd him at large, that we are no otherwise bound by Oath to our Superiours than he is, viz. to obey them in lawful Things; and in which God requires his and our Obedience. And what God requires cannot without Rudeness be called *Hampering*. But if he means by *Hampering*, that Governours may sometimes take Occasion from our Oaths to deal hardly with us, and expose us to Hardships, he is as liable to be hamper'd by his Oath, as we: there being no fence against unjust prosecutions of Men in Power, that will lie at the Carch.

He saith then, *He is not liable to be call'd upon to execute any Canons, but such as are truly Apostolical, and contained in Scripture and which therefore are liable to no Exception.* If he means, by *truly Apostolical*, &c. what is expressly and *in Specie* contain'd in Scripture, then this which he saith is not true. For he may be call'd on to keep Lent, to subscribe xxxvi Articles, to keep the Door unlock'd when he is Preaching, &c. None of which are *Apostolical*, or *in Specie* contain'd in Scripture. But if he means, that he is not so liable to be call'd upon, or put upon the doing any thing not warranted by Scripture, but that he may refuse it (which is all that is true in the Case) then he hath not any *Advantage* above us; for we owe Submission to no Mortal, but according to Scripture and the Warrant thereof.

He adds, *He is not forc'd with a great Appearance of Solemnity to declare an unfeigned Assent and Consent to what he doth not heartily approve of.* If he insinuates that we do not heartily approve of the Lawfulness of the Use of what we assent and consent to but that we use what we do not so approve of, it is a most uncharitable Suggestion or Slander. But if he means more by *heartily approving*, he himself hath been forc'd to own it to be *Flourish and Hyperbole*.

He saith further, *He is not obliged to any thing in the Conduct of his Flock, saving to a few necessary Things agreed upon for common Convenience.* Yet he hath sometimes owned several *Inconveniencies* in the way that he is in, and he owns several *Imperfections*, p. 102. And no State can be without them here. See Mr. Baxter at the Funeral of Mr. Corbet, p. 3. But yet *Inconveniencies* will not excuse us from *Duties*, and we must do as well as we can with them: But we are lyable to them on both Sides, and we shall shew on which side there are most, by examining the Particulars, and when we come to set forth our *Advantages*.

He saith, *When Persons come to the Lord's Table, if they are either grossly ignorant or scandalous, he can keep them from it, till they are either better instructed or reformed, without any Danger of Persecution, which all must own a mighty Discouragement.* And it is plainly prov'd in our 2^d. Defence, to which nothing need be added, that our Law doth authorize and peremptorily require us to do the same. And so we are as safe by Law as he, though neither he nor we may be always free from unjust Persecutions upon one account or other. But we are in no more Danger by the right Application of the Law, than he is of being sent for a Soldier.

But He is not tempted, he saith, to prostitute holy Things, for fear of an Action of Damage for hindring a Man of an Office, for which his receiving the Sacrament is required as a Qualification. This seems at first Blush the same with the former, proceeding upon a not right Understanding the Law and the Case in this Matter. For a Person's Qualification for an Office depends not on his receiving the Sacrament from the Minister of his Parish; who is therefore no more concern'd in that Statute than any other Minister in the Kingdom. But he must proceed according to those Statutes, Canon, and Rubricks that require him to exclude the unqualify'd. But the insinuated Charge here is indeed another Thing; he thinks that he hath frighted us, by often repeating this Case of a Man in Office coming to be qualify'd; and now he thinks we may be tempted to do this Wickedness for Fear. And we must own that no Condition is free from Temptation, any more than Inconvenience. And we must none of us brag of our selves. But this we say, that a conscientious Conformer is not one jot more in Danger to be tempted by Fear, than a godly Non-conformist is in Danger of being tempted by Hope, yea, or Fear either, in case a wealthy Contributor offers himself. By the same Grace that

that the one escapes the Temptation so doth the other.

But *He can administer Baptism*, he adds, and all the other Ordinances of the Christian Religion, according to the Purity of their Institution, without any needless Additions, without being hard upon the Scrupulous, or at all breaking in upon that Liberty, to which our Lord hath given all his Subjects a Right. To which we answer, so can we. As to the needless Additions, that he would make to intrench upon the Purity of the Ordinance, we know of none such. As to Baptism, which he singles out for an Instance, the Church declares there is nothing belongs to it but Washing with Water in the Name of the Trinity: Yet in the Solemnity of the Administration, other Things, in the general commanded by Christ, may then as well as at other Times be used, viz. Prayers, Thanksgivings, a Declaration of the Covenant between God and the Baptized, a Confessing Christ before Men, and glorying in a crucified Saviour. These are indeed no Parts of Baptism; but may be fitly joyn'd with the Administration thereof, by Words or Actions apt to signifie our Minds. Then for excluding the Scrupulous, that he supposes to be a breaking in upon the Liberty of Christ's Followers, it hath been shew'd him that no-

thing in Conformity obligeth to it. However he owns elsewhere, in fact it may so happen in *his* Congregation (and it may so fall out accidentally in any Congregation) in which Case he only tells us, they may go to another. But what if the other Congregations have the like Determinations, which they scruple, as well as the former? Or, what if they refuse him the *orderly Recommendation* to another Church, as the *Heads of Agreement* require? then there is the same Hardship still. And yet suppose a Man can go to another Congregation, still there is the *breaking in* upon this Man's *Liberty*, and *bearing hard upon the Scrupulous*, in the Congregation that he leaveth, where he could not agree to the Form of Singing, (suppose) to some Officers set up, to the Time of Administration, or other Determinations; which Mr. Calamy grants, every Congregation has Power to make. In such Cases, where the Matter of the Determination is lawful, the Exclusion is only *Accidental*, as we shew'd in our former Defence, and may be found in the best managed and most wary Congregation that can be.

But he saith, *He is not forced to a stunted Form, whatever Varieties are required by particular Accidents and Occasions: And if he*
prefers

prefers Forms, he is at liberty to use them, provided he and his People agree upon it; and if they do not, he is at liberty to let them alone; which is more agreeable than to be absolutely confin'd, where our Lord hath left a Liberty. If by this he would insinuate, that 'tis an Advantage to be altogether without a standing Form or Liturgy, we must crave leave to differ from him; and shall urge it from Mr. Baxter the other way in its proper place. But if he layeth the Stress upon the being absolutely confin'd to them, whatever Varieties are required by particular Accidents and Occasions. We answer him, That we are not so confin'd; but that for them other Prayers are allowed, as in all Fasts, Thanksgivings, Wars, Raging Diseases: And other constant Prayers in the Pulpit are also required by Can. 55. and the daily Practice of the Church from the Reformation to this day, is agreeable thereunto. We shall set down this in the Words of Mr. Baxter in answer to D. O. in the last of the *Traits* that go under the general Name of *Catholick Communion*, p. 34, 35. D. O. had objected, "That the Exercise of Spiritual Gifts is expressly prohibited in the Prescription of this Liturgical Worship. To which Mr. Baxter saith, *It is a Mistake* [marking it the xxxvj Error] *that the Exercise of Spiritual Gifts is*

expressly forbidden; unless you had meant, that just at the Use of the Liturgy, Extemporate Utterance is forbidden; but it is not so in the Pulpit. D. O. proceeds, "The pretence of Mens Liberty to use their Gifts in Prayer before Sermons, and in Preaching, is ridiculous; they are excluded in all the solemn Worship of the Church, To which Mr. Baxter saith; This Answer is not only a Mistake [marking it the xxxvij Error] but of an ill Aspect upon your selves. It's not true, that the Use of Gifts is excluded in all the solemn Worship of the Church; as if Prayer, Praise, Thanksgiving, Explication of the Scripture, Reproof, Exhortation, Comfort, Direction, Benediction, were no part of the solemn Worship of the Church. Indeed some Superconformists have said so, but I had hoped that you would not. I said, it's of an ill Aspect: For, 1. if Preaching and Pulpit-Prayer before and after, be none of the solemn Worship of the Churches, then all those Churches which seldom use any other (saving a Psalm, which is a Liturgick Form) have no solemn Worship at all. 2. But if it be otherwise (as it is) then the Parish-Churches so far excel most of you, that they have all that you have (Pulpit-Prayer and Sermon, and sometimes a Chapter) and all the Common Prayer more. And is not that better than your Nothing (except at Sacrament &c.)

ment?) I know that the Nonconformists that I have convers'd with, are in Judgment for more (for reading the Psalms, Chapters, Creed, Lord's Prayer, Decalogue, &c.) But I have come into so few of their Churches that do any more than the common Pulpit-work (sing a Psalm, Pray and Preach there) that I have in that respect preferred the Churches that do all that, and add all the Liturgy besides, more than you use. Thus far Mr. Baxter in Answer to D. O. or if you please, to Mr. Calamy. And as for the Liberty he speaks of, we would only ask him, If his Congregation are for a Form, and he is against it as less convenient, and yet thinks it lawful, must he not in that Case comply with the Determinations of his Congregation? Or if they are against it, and he for it, must not he then let it alone? And yet either of these Ways he loseth his Liberty. Or suppose the major Part of his Congregation are for a Form, and the minor is against it, must not he then, if he thinks a Form lawful, comply with the major Part? Now this is our Case; The major Part of the Body of the People of England have declared for, and enacted a Form by their Representatives; would it not be very unreasonable now to comply with the minor Part against the major, when one or other necessarily must be chosen? In this Case there must
neces-

necessarily be an Abridgment of *Liberty* to a Man, unless he will act unreasonably, and contrary to the Form and Nature of Societies.

He then proceeds. *If a Prince dieth on a sudden, and he hath notice of it, he is not oblig'd to wait for particular Directions, to leave out his Name in the publick Prayers, or expect so comical a List of needless Alterations, as is usually in such cases in the Church.* The insinuated Charge is, That we are obliged not to leave out the dead Prince's Name, till we have particular Directions from the Government. This is certainly one of the wildest Charges that ever was brought. Whence should such an Obligation arise? Who ever waited one Minute, after he had certain Notice of the Prince's Death, for Direction to leave out his Name? If he never heard of such a thing, what must the World think of such Insinuations? King *William* died on a Lord's-day Morning; some Churches knew of it in the Morning, and left out his Name; but doth he know of one Church in *London* that us'd it in the Afternoon? Well, but afterwards there comes out an Order of the Government about it; yes, some Weeks after; and for what? To direct the Printers and Correctors of the Liturgy about the Names of the *Royal Family*, which upon such a Death

a Death are to be changed. It does not appear in all things alike plainly to every one how the Change is to be made. When there were two joyn'd together on the Throne, as in the late happy Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, several Words were left out, and others put in, besides the Change of Names; and which were again alter'd when the Throne was filled with a single Person. And there is great need of this sometimes as an Act of the Government; for though usually when the *Sovereign* dieth, the *Successor* is known, yet often the Names of the next *Relations*, that are to be mentioned, are unknown, till the *Order* comes to give Direction in it. We waited for no *Order* to put Queen *Anne* in the room of King *William*; but we did for the putting the *Princess Sophia* in the room of the *Princess Anne* of Denmark. Aye, but he saith, This *Order* of the *Queen* and *Privy Council* is a comical *List of needless Alterations*. Pray, Sir, a little more Manners! Who could be thus bold to affront and ridicule the Government, but one who boasts himself in his Freedom from Submission thereunto?

He proceeds again; If there be a *Popish Prince* upon the Throne, he is free from any Obligation to pray, that God would keep and strengthen such a Prince in the true worshipping
of

of him, while yet he esteems him an Idolater, And if this Prince aims to bring in Popery, and a Foreign Prince, when invited, comes to deliver the Nation from Popery and Slavery; he has nothing to do to make it part of his Prayers, that God would be the Defender and Keeper of this Popish Prince, and give him the Victory over all his Enemies, and so defeat the Design of our Deliverer. As to the first Instance, he cannot but know that we do believe the Papists guilty of Idolatry and false Worship, in the Worship of Images, and of the Host, and in praying to Saints and Angels, &c. and that this is the Doctrine of our Church, and is so maintain'd to be by our greatest Divines. And therefore he ought in all Reason to think, that it cannot be intended by these Offices, that we should pray for their being preserved in their Idolatries. But he knoweth that we believe also, that a great part of their Worship, (as to the Matter of it) is true Worship, viz. of one God in Three Persons, and through Jesus Christ, &c. And is express only with respect to the true worshipping of God, that a Papist may be kept and strengthened therein. And when we pray for this, we do at the same time desire, that he may be delivered from the false worshipping of him, and much more from the Worship of Creatures instead of him, which is the quite con-

contrary to his Insinuation. As to his second Instance, we did not believe the *Prince of Orange*, any more than the *Princess* that went over to him, to be *King James's* Enemy. But those that advis'd him against, and hindered him from calling a Parliament, and that put him upon such Measures as were contrary to the *English* Constitution; these were *his* Enemies, as well as the *Nations*. And these we could heartily pray against, that were for subverting our Religion, invading our Properties, and bringing in a dispensing Despotick Power contrary to Law, that that *Prince* might have been delivered from them. And we could at the same time rejoice in hopes of our Deliverance in such a Way, when there was no other left to preserve our just Rights, which are not at the Will of any Prince whatsoever, but are settled by National Compact. Such is our Constitution, and our Prayers ought never to be intended, or understood in an Inconsistence with it.

But then he adds moreover, *That if a spurious Prince be obtruded upon the Nation, he is not bound solemnly to give God Thanks according to a Form prescribed.* But we must tell him, it is not our Part or Province to judge of the Legitimacy of Princes; but are to refer that to the States of the Kingdom. But if the Government appoint a *Thanksgiving*

giving to be kept, he is as fully bound to obey it, as we. But as to the *Form* in such Case prescribed, it is no part of our Liturgy; and if there be any thing unlawful to be used therein, we are no ways bound to use it neither. And as to all in this and the foregoing Article, the Law hath now secur'd both him and us from Danger.

He saith, He is not bound to *hope* against *Hope* in the Case of the Deceased; nor doth he send those to Heaven at the Grave, whom he condemns in the Pulpit. Nor yet are we. But though we declare in the Pulpit the Condemnation of all them that die impenitently, yet we do not pretend to judge that this of that Person in particular did die without Repentance, unless there be apparent Ground for it; for *Charity hopes all things*. And if we declare our Hopes of the Repentance of such as have express their Sorrow and Remorse for their Sins in their Sickness, doth this contradict our Declaration in the Pulpit against the Impenitent? What have we to do to judge the Hearts of Men contrary to their own express Profession? But if there be no ground for such a charitable Judgment of a wicked Man's Repentance, and so no Hope of him, then are we not bound to use the Office, or those Expressions of *Hope* therein. This we have sufficiently proved, to which we need add no more.

He goeth on, That he can cast out a Brother, that is notoriously scandalous, in pursuance of the Gospel-Rule, without any other Steps than are therein mentioned; conversing with him first alone, then with two or three, and at last bringing the Matter before the Church, without any Concern with the Civilians, who make a Gain of Ungodliness, and get their Livelihood very much by the Sins of the People. But he hath not Power to administer an Oath for Confirmation to the Witnesses, to prove the Fact against which he would proceed, as the Scripture requires should be done to put an end to a Controversie in Judgment. And what Church doth he mean here that he is to bring the Matter before? Will he confine this to a particular Congregation? Will he allow of no Appeal? Or will he put this Power into the Hands of a single Minister only? If he had explain'd his Meaning, it had been more easie to have known what to have said to him. He might have seen this Matter set in a better Light in our *First Defence* p. 110, to 116. As for what he saith of the *Civilians*, meaning their Courts, it is meer Railery; and is as applicable to any other Court of Justice, and the *Lawyers* therein, where they who are concern'd in the convicting and punishing evil Doers; have their Salaries and Fees.

But we find, it is no new thing with Mr. Calamy to reflect on Governments.

He saith next, *He is not obliged to confine his Charity to a Party.* And he might as well have said, He is not obliged to murder, steal, or commit Adultery. Who is oblig'd to confine his Charity to a Party? What Charge he would insinuate by this pretended *Advantage*, we cannot imagine. For our Parts we extend our Charity even to him. We know no such rigid Notion, that we are bound to receive, That none can be good Men but those that are of our own Way. There must be Abatements made for involuntary Errors and Mistakes in Men: and a great many Circumstances are to be considered, that may lay a just Foundation for the Exercise of our Charity to those that differ from us, while they fear God and work Righteousness.

He saith, *He can keep private Days of Humiliation upon any Emergency publick or private.* And if it be for *Exercise of Devotion* we in the Establishment can do so as well as he. But if he does it for the *Ends* in which the Canon forbids it, viz. the excommunicating Persons possessed, or for seditious Purposes, the Government will take hold of him and that justly.

of Ministerial Conformity. 115

In short, he saith, He can do whatever Christ hath made his Duty, as a Minister, without having his Conscience hamper'd by any ensnaring Bond. He can deliver the whole Will of God, secure the Purity of all divine Institutions, and use the Liberty his Great Master hath left him in Things indifferent without Confinement. And so may we in the Ministry of the Church of England do whatever Christ hath commanded us; let him prove the contrary if he can. Mr. Baxter declares, Append. to his Life, p. 78. That Ministers of the Church of England have by the Law of the Land all Power belonging to Pastors. And again, In many Parishes of England, there is all that is essential to true Pastors and Churches: We can declare the whole Will of God, so far as we know it; For what should hinder us? Nay, we are bound to it in a solemn Manner at our Ordination: And what a strange Insinuation is here, as if we could not? And we do also enjoy the Purity of all Divine Institutions; It is not enough for him to deny it, or to imply a Charge against us without Proof. And we use the Liberty that Christ has left us: But we believe, that a Liberty from the Commands of Magistrates in lawful Things, as hath been before stated, is none of that Liberty which our Great Master hath left either him or us.

Thus we have gone over the *Advantages* that he pretends he has in his Ministry above us; and have remov'd the *Prejudices*, that he hath advanc'd against our Ministry for the supposed Want of them. What he adds further, p. 101. concerns the *People*, not us in our Ministry, and so we pass it. And yet what he saith as to *them*, may by an easie Application receive Satisfaction, from what we have replied to his pretended *Advantages* over us. And this is all that he hath to say in his glorying over us; and what a meer Nothing it is, we dare appeal to the Judgment of every indifferent Person.

But we shall go further with him, and shew him that we of the Establish'd Church have some *Advantages* in our Way and in our Ministry, which he hath not.

First, We exercise our Ministry as *Members* of a *National Church*, which is no small Privilege to them that believe with Mr *Baxter*, That it was our Lord's Design that such *National Churches* should be erected. This he often proves, particularly, *Appendix* to his *Life*, p. 70. at large, and p. 78. He saith, he will prove against all *Deniers*, That the Church of England, as it is a *Christian Kingdom*, containing confederate Churches, under a *Christian King* and *Laws*, is that very *Form* that *Christ* offer'd to settle in *Judaea*

and did settle by Constantine. Without mentioning his Reasons, we shall only add the Testimony of Mr. Stoddon, *Pastors Charge*, p. 89. who mentioning a *National Church*, adds, *of which that eminent Servant of Christ, Mr. Baxter, hath given so rational and scriptural an Account; and which, that I know, is not by any one, as yet, answer'd.*

Then we exercise our Ministry under an *Episcopacy*, or Superiority of governing *Bishops*, which *Superior Rank*, Mr. Baxter saith, *Christ settled in his Church, Discourse of Knowledge and Love, Ep. Ded.* which cannot be refused, as he hints, without Danger of charging *Christ with seeming Mutability, as settling a Form of Ministry and Government, which he would have to continue but one Age.* This Advantage we shew'd at large from Mr. Baxter, *1st Def.* p. 60, 61. and shall now add the Testimony of that other Aged Non-conformist, Mr. Stoddon, in the before-cited *Pastor's Charge*, preach'd before an Assembly of Ministers in *Exon*, A. 1694. who having spoken of the Church *Congregational* or *Parochial*, comes next to that, which is *Presbyterial* or *Diocesan*, which, p. 125. he saith, *alone is that which in Scripture is call'd a Church, that is, a perfect and adult Church, that hath Power by its Officers, to propagate and constitute other Churches and Congregati-*

ons, and to over-rule all the particular Pastors and Congregations that are within its Bounds. Then speaking of the Part Ruling, and Part Ruled therein, he saith, p. 126. *This Company of Ruling Presbyters must have one Head or President, which is the Episcopus Episcoporum, or else it were a Monster, an Heap of Confusion, and unorganiz'd Matter. This Head must be One, else there can be no Union or Consistency of the Parts, nor Attainment of its Ends. This one Head must be fixt and constant, and that in the same Person, till there be just Cause to change; else the Government cannot be steddly, but is dissolved and broken, and consequently the Church, with all its particular Congregations, most dangerously expos'd. And this is that Government which is called Aristocracy, and may as properly be called a mixt or limited Monarchy; which I take to be the most agreeable to the Pattern given us in the Mount of the Holy Scriptures. And is so far from intrenching upon the Right, or infringing the Liberty or Government of the Church Congregational, that it is the best Defence to it. Thus far that Aged Nonconformist.*

Further, Our entring into our Office, and our ministring in the particular Churches, to which we belong, hath the Advantage above that of our Brethren in several Particulars, which Mr. Baxter reckons up, in the

the above cited *Append.* p. 74. wherein he saith, the Churches that differ from us *swerve from the Rule*; inasmuch that he adventures to say, that to join with such as fixed covenanted Members will be a State of Sin. We shall mention some, as First, he saith, that Scripture fixed Ministers or Elders were all ordained by superior general Pastors, either alone, or with their Presbyters: And so are we. This is an Advantage, as it renders our Ministry more currant, and indisputable, and acceptable amongst the Generality of the People of England. There is no Controversie about our Ministry, which we receive by such an Episcopal Ordination, except it be amongst a very few. Mr. Baxter goes on, Scripture-particular Churches were all distinguish'd by the Limits of their Habitations or Proximity, So are ours. And he adds, that there never were two Churches in the same City or Bounds, save Hereticks, or of Men of divers Tongues, at least where one could hold them all. And then, that no lawful Church in Scripture was gather'd out of a true Gospel-Church, Which is our Privilege, that ours are not, And p. 79. He saith, The confederate Parishes-Churches of England, that have able godly Pastors, want nothing, which Christ or his Apostles, or the universal Church of Christ for 600 Years, yea, or to this Day, did ever make or

judge necessary to the being of Ministers or Church. Nor have the said Churches any Error or Sin, in Doctrine, Worship, or Government; which either Christ or his Apostles, or the universal Church of Christ for 600 Years after Christ, did judge inconsistent with the being of a valid Minister, and true visible Churches. We are not chargeable with gathering Churches out of such Churches as these. He saith moreover, that Scripture Churches never divided the Christians of the same Family, some to one Church, and some to another. Neither do we. And as he concludes, Our Churches are compaginate and confederate, so as the Members of one Body should be, and as Scripture Churches were, and as Christ would have had the Jewish National Church to be. Thus far Mr. Baxter, as to the particular Churches in which we minister, in all which we have the Advantage above our Brethren.

Moreover we have a mighty Advantage by the Certainty and Concord of our Church Worship, in Comparison of those that Mr. Baxter observes, *Ibid.* p. 75. Have little more than such Preaching and Praying, which cannot be known for true or false, sound or unsound, till the Words are past. And so, adds he, all God's Worship must be continually uncertain to the Flocks, and of as many different Strains,

of Ministerial Conformity. 121

as the Preachers differ in Parts and Wisdom: and it must be low, and poor, and confused, where-ever the Ministers are young, raw, erroneous, or ignorant. Mr. Baxter hath shewn in divers Particulars, *Christ. Direct.* par. 3. Qu. 78. and the Thing is plain in it self, that both *Forms* of Prayer, and *Free-praying* without a stinted Form, have both their Commodities and Discommodities: And then he concludes with giving his own Judgment. *I crave leave to propose*, saith he, *that my own Judgment is, that somewhat of both Ways join'd together, will best obviate the Incommodities of both.* Now we have both Ways with us, which our Brethren have not; and therein we have the Advantage. And thereby our Worship also comes to be more currently acceptable. Most of our People are for a stinted Form, and some are for free Prayer: and so we have that, which may be most desirable by those of both sorts. We need not insist here upon the Advantages of Free-Prayer, which our Brethren now do only chuse. But this may be said, that with a great Number of People, a Form hath the Advantage above it. Mr. Baxter observes amongst other things, that in a Form, the Auditors know before-hand whether that which they are to join in, be sound or unsound, having Time to try it; and they can more readily

dily put in their Consent to what is spoken, and make the Prayers their own---it being hard for the duller sort of Hearers, to concur with an Understanding and Consent as quick as the Speakers Words are: not but that this may be done, but not without great Difficulty in the duller sort. So that though Worship may be laudably managed by some Persons, and for the Profit of some, without a Form; yet it could not be so generally or nationally, either by the weaker sort of Ministers, or for the Use of Multitudes of Hearers. In conceived Prayer, the Hearer must first exercise his Understanding to conceive the Meaning of the Words spoken (and if there be Obscurity in them, or Dulness of Apprehension in him, the whole is stopt at first) And there must be withal an Act of his Judgment to try the Words, whether apt and fit to be joined with. And then the Affections are to follow. And all these must be at every Petition in a conceived Prayer, without Stop or Pause. All which it is not easie for the duller sort to exert with so much Quickness. Whereas in a Form the previous Acts are over for the main, and the Words are understood and try'd before; and the Suppliant hath nothing more to do, but to excite and join his Affections, and lift up his Heart agreeably to the Words. So that

to
Ex
Sto
He
der
qu
nu
Mi
is
tho
sta
to
eas
sam
mo
the
Wo
atta
plai
also
Affe
Thi
whi
con
For
are
also
pur
Cha

to many Persons here is a nearer way to the Exercise of gracious Affections, without any Stop or Remove, than there is in the other. Here must indeed be the Exercise of the Understanding and Judgment too; but this is quickly performed by Reason of the continual Use of the same Words, which the Mind is before-hand acquainted with. This is a great Advantage to *such Persons*; for though Persons well instructed may understand Words at first Hearing, and be able to go along with them; yet this cannot be easily done by others, who must have the same Words often repeated, in order to a more clear and distinct Apprehension of what they pray for.

We may observe further in our Church-Worship some other *Advantages*, both for the attaining of a more clear Knowledge of the plain and necessary Things of Religion; and also for the exciting and exercise of gracious Affections. The clearer Knowledge of the Things of Religion is promoted by that which we mentioned before, *viz.* by the continual Use of the same Words and Forms; by which the Ideas of holy things are more easily convey'd to the Mind; as also by the constant Use of the *Holy Scriptures*, which are read in our Churches, four Chapters every Lord's-Day, and eight or more Psalms

Psalms or Hymns, besides other Portions thereof: And by the constant Use of the *Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*, which are the Ground of the Catechism; by which these great Things come to be more riveted in the Memories, and clearly conceived, than they can be supposed to be, where they are seldom or never repeated: And by picking out and reading such Portions of Scripture at particular Times which do most fully declare the most fundamental Doctrines of our Religion, viz. on one Part of the Year about the *Birth* of Christ, at another about his *Death*, then of his *Resurrection* and of his *Ascension*, and of the Mission and Operations of the *Holy Spirit*; at which Times also these Doctrines are wont to be insisted on in the Pulpit; without which People might attend many Years, and hear many good Sermons on particular Texts of Scripture, and not be particularly taught these Fundamental Doctrines, unless they have the Advantage of a Catechistical private Education. And for the exciting and exercise of gracious *Affections*, and the keeping the Spirit awake, the Peoples bearing a Part in our Form (which is so excepted against by some) hath a considerable Tendency. We shall set down this in Mr. Baxter's Words, *Chr. Direct.* Tom. 3. p. 146. *The*

primitive Christians, saith he, were so full of the Zeal and Love of Christ, that they would have taken it for an Injury, and a quenching of the Spirit, to have been wholly restrain'd from bearing their Part in the Praises of the Church. The Use of the Tongue keeps awake the Mind, and stirs up God's Graces in his Servants. It was the Decay of Zeal in the People that first shut out Responses. While they kept up the ancient Zeal, they were inclin'd to take their Part vocally in the Worship. And this was seconded by the Pride and Usurpation of some Priests thereupon, who thought the People of God too prophane, to speak in the Assemblies, or meddle too much with holy Things. What an Advantage to the Exercise of Love and Devotion is there in the affectionate Hymns of Praise, so distinctly reciting the Benefits of Redemption, &c. and in the frequent Use of the Doxology, *Glory be to the Father, &c.* By which the Praises that are directed to one God in the Psalms and Hymns, are distinctly attributed in Gospel Times to the three glorious Persons, whom we adore. What an Advantage for the Exercise of Repentance is there in reciting the Commandments (by which is the Knowledge of Sin) with a particular Application to our selves, in a Petition for Mercy and Grace after every one of them? What an Advantage must it be

to

to the Exercise of *Faith*, solemnly by Word and Action to declare our Believing in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Recital of the several *Creeds*? And whereas Faith, in the *Attributes* of God, and *Mediation* of Christ, is to be our great Work both in Prayer and Praise, What Advantage must it be, to have the frequent Mention of his several *Attributes*, and his Son's *Merits*, as is done in the Liturgy, in comparison of having the same only once mention'd in the beginning and ending of one long continued Prayer?

It is another *Advantage*, which we think we may insist upon, that we minister before God, in a Way most free from *Superstition*, or Danger thereof; not only from *positive* Superstition, but *negative* also: as Mr. Baxter rightly distinguisheth, *Care of Ch. Driv.* p. 182. The one is when we say, That God hath commanded what he hath not; the other is, when we say, That God hath forbidden what he hath not. The one fathers upon God falsely what he hath not ordained, the other fears where no Fear is. Both of them are, as he adds, a *belying* of God, an *adding* to his Word, and the great dividing Engine of the Church. There is much *Superstition* in *not doing*, as well as in *doing*. See Burgess's Answer rejoyn'd, Pref. p. 64. So that, if a Man abstains from anything, out of Conscience to God's

Pro

Prohibition, which he hath not prohibited, he is equally guilty of Superstition with him that doth a thing out of Conscience to God's Command, which he hath not commanded. And we must needs say, we should think we should be guilty of it, and of *adding to the Word*, if we should pretend that Scripture had given *particular* Rules about Gestures, Habits, professing Signs, &c. where they are only *general*; or if we should think or pretend that we come *neater the Pattern of Scripture* for using one sort of Gestures, Habits and Signs, than for using others, that are equally warranted by the *General Rules* thereof. And we think we should be further to blame, should we at the same time neglect, or *make void the Commandments of God* in other matters. The Scripture saith, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, (meaning all our lawful Governours) and *whosoever curseth or revileth them or their Authority, shall be guilty*: We dare not say then, *it is Corban*, or pretend Exemptions in such and such Cases, where we do not find that the Scripture hath exempted us. They that come *nearest to the Scripture Pattern*, have undoubtedly the *Advantage* on their side: But whether it be *Any one* on the one side, who *rejects* the Determination of sundry Circumstances left undetermined by Christ, about Gestures, Habits, and professing Signs,
(which

(which others use) under pretence that they are not particularly found in Scripture, tho agreeable to the general Rules thereof; or we on the other side, who obey the Christian Magistrates in lawful things, which the Scripture doth so vehemently urge, (while the other denies their Power or Authority therein) let every Christian judge.

It is also another great Advantage and Happines to us, that our Ministrations of Holy Things, is in a Church, which God hath mightily own'd, and to which he hath eminently vouchsafed his gracious Spirit and Presence; which hath been the Bulwark of the Protestant Religion, and preserved even by Miracles of Deliverances. The ancient *Nonconforming Puritans* never thought it a Glory to separate from, but a matter of very great Lamentation when they could not minister in it. And to separate from a Church because of the Impositions of lawful things we should fear, would be in Appearance to separate from the Catholick Church, or from all the Churches upon Earth; seeing there is no Church upon Earth without some such. To separate upon the account of an imposed Liturgy, or significant Ceremonies, &c. is too like a Separation from the whole Body of Christ, as Mr. Baxter speaks concerning some Persons, in the before-cited *Append. p. 73*.

With whom would these Men hold Communion, if they had liv'd in any Age till 200 Years ago? When, as far as ever I can find, there was not one Congregation of Christians or Hereticks in all the World, that was against Forms of Worship, or Bishops, or all Ceremonies. Let them name one if they can.

And we have this great Advantage in our Ministry yet further, that we promote a Reformation in the most laudable Way, in a Way that is most apt to produce the same; and to which the Way of Separation in its own Nature, we fear, is contrary. For whatever Accidental Effect it may be supposed to have towards it, it is apt in its own Nature to exasperate and heighten our Differences, and to prejudice others against what they that separate, do desire. Whereas to comply with the Christian Magistrate in things that we judge lawful, tends to bring Men to a Temper, and to incline them to do what we reasonably desire, towards a nearer Approach to Perfection in the Church, or towards a Condescension to our Brethren, who differ from us. And they who are perswaded, that the Reasons why some stiff Men oppose the Alterations which are desir'd, are purely taken from the Exasperations they receive from some in the Separation; will always judge, That the Advantage as to pressing forward to-
wards

wards a further Reformation, lies on our side. It is the moderate part of the Church of England, that have shew'd more hearty Concern for, and more endeavour'd after Union and Reformation these seventeen Years past, than any other considerable Number of Men have done, or are capable of doing in the way that they go on in.

And we have not only an Advantage in these things to that desired End, above what our Brethren now have, but also above what our Fathers had; our Lot being cast in a time when the Churches are fill'd with such excellent Bishops, eminent for Piety, Moderation, and Zeal for God. When the Old Puritans wrote earnestly against Separation, there were many things with which they were justly aggrieved, from which we are freed. They desired and waited for Alterations, when there was no humane likelihood of any such thing. Whereas now there is a great Disposition in the Church to encourage Moderation. It is true, the Work met with Stops in 1689. And he saith right, we dare not affirm what we quoted from the Historian; but we verily believe (by Converse with Men of the same Temper with those that seem'd most opposite to Abate ments in the then Lower House of Convocation) that the Miscarriage came not from their

Fondness

fondness for these things, that we desire to have alter'd: but, as they pretend, because they know not what will satisfy; when they see so many unaccountable Charges muster'd up, like this of Mr. Calamy, That "Conformity requires us to pray for our Princes, that God would grant them in Health and Wealth long to live, when we know that they are dead and buried, till an Order of Council comes forth to relieve us. And when we strive to pacifie these Gentlemen, by telling them, That these Charges are like *Chancery Bills*, in which many unaccountable things are suggested and heap'd together, and some few things only are meant and insisted upon; then they remain still stumbled about the Denial of the Doctrine about indifferent Things, and Obedience to Governours, as we shew'd from Dr. Sh--- *Second Defence* p. 85. Yet notwithstanding these Difficulties, the Interest of Moderation is growing (blessed be God) and increasing in the Church, we hope, daily. The Governours of the Church being such as our *Fathers* did long to see in those Dignities. In some measure we have what they waited for, and are encouraged in the way of our Duty to wait on.

And we must needs say after all, That we cannot but heartily wish, that our Governours would not continue to insist upon

the Use of, or exert their Power in several of these things: But that for the promoting of the publick Peace, and because of the different Apprehensions that many pious and good Men have thereof, they might be conceded to them. The Prejudices of Education, and different Studies that Men have been engaged in, we all know, are often a very heavy Weight even upon Good and Learned Men. And supposing that these things might be retained still without any Inconvenience, if they were not so contested among us, and there were no Occasion taken therefrom for Heat and Animosity: yet seeing it is otherwise, one would think that external, indifferent Modes and Signs that might well be spar'd, without any Detriment to the Religion, Worship, Discipline or Government established among us, should not be of that Value as to deserve to be retained, in these distracting Circumstances, which we are now in by Occasion thereof. Religion is never advanced by being embodied in Externals; it then only becomes a *Shibboleth* and Distinction, which those only have a Zeal for, that have least of the vital Flame of true Love to God or Man; which is the true Spirit of Christianity, and which wise and good Men only value.

AN ANSWER

TO Mr. Calamy's INDEX.

WE added to our *Second Defence* an *Index* touching Mr. Calamy's manner of handling this *Controversie*, in hopes that our *Dissenting Brethren*, upon the Summary View of Mr. Calamy's Writings therein, would discountenance and disown so strange an Undertaking; and we do not despair of attaining our End. In return, he is pleased to *Appeal* our *Index* by another. Concerning which, we observe in the general, that we should think the *fairer Way* had been, *first*, to have answer'd our *Charge* before he had *recriminated* and made another. For if we had been guilty of never so many Absurdities in our way of Writing, that would not have made his *peculiar manner* of handling this *Controversie*,

verſie, ever the more juſtifiable. *Recrimination* is but a poor way of arguing at any time, and of no uſe, while the former *Charge* ſtands unanſwer'd. We further obſerve, that he makes an *Index* to our Books, and not to his own, and thinks it the better way. Whereas we, in directing the Reader to our own Book, did point to the *Pages* where the things were prov'd, which we alledg'd; whereas he does not direct us to any place, where the things are pretended to be prov'd, which he alledgeth againſt us, ſave in one or two places only, which we ſhall ſhew him are nothing to the purpoſe.

We ſhall go over his *Index* in all the XX Articles thereof.

I. He ſaith; I make *Tragical Complaints* with very little Reason; and quotes *Epist. Ned. p. 2.* 1 *Def. p. 84.* let theſe be compar'd with our 2d *Def. Preface p. 10.* and 2d *Def. p. 2, to 8.* And we leave the Reader to judge what Reason we had for Complaints. He adds, *I paſs lightly by ſuch things as I had abundant Reason to complain of,* and inſtances in the *Abuſes of Godfathers, Miſapplication of ſundry Canons, ill Management of the Eccleſiaſtical Courts.* And yet in the places to which he refers his Reader, we declare againſt the *Abuſes, Miſapplications, and ill Management;* and this ſo plainly, that when it is for his

turn,

turn, he unjustly reflects upon us, as *speaking against the Canons themselves, reflecting Discredit on the Church, &c.* Mod. Nonc. p. 288, 337, 353. and many other Places; and *How then, do we lightly pass them by?*

H. He saith, *I discover a Dislike of the Impositions, and yet stiffly endeavour to uphold them.* *Impositions* are an ambiguous Term, and are taken, either 1. for the Matter or *Things impos'd.* 2. For the *imposing them*, in such and such Circumstances, and under such and such Penalties. As to the latter of these, we have declar'd, that *we had no Hand or Heart in the making or continuing sundry Impositions.* But as to the Matter or *Things impos'd* we do indeed vindicate the *Lawfulness* of them in several of the Instances that he has set down; and, Where is the Inconsistency in this Matter? It is the *submitting to them* that we defend, as being Things in themselves *lawful*, and which may *lawfully be submitted to* by us, and not the *imposing them* in such Circumstances, &c. And yet some of his Instances are far from being rightly worded. As, that *I vindicate the promiscuous Use of the Office of Burial.* If he means it as to the Persons, that he shews it is not suited to, we disclaim the Use of it as to them, and declare against it. That *I vindicate certain Canons* there enume-

rated. Whereas we distinguish of the *right Application* of them, in such particular Instances, in which they may be lawfully observed; and of the *Wrong Application* of them in other Instances in which we have nothing to do with them, 2^d Def. p. 287, to 296. We stand to what he reckons an *Inconsistency*, and which we are sure is none, viz. to long for *Alterations and Concessions*, and yet to defend the *Lawfulness* of the *Things impos'd*. Our Reasons are set down, 1 Def. Ep. Ced. p. 5. 2 Def. Pref. p. ult. And we affirm that *his Way*, and not *ours*, is the direct Method to *obstruct the Reformation*, and by passionate Aggravations to hinder the Union and Amendments in order to it: as we have shewn, 2^d Def. p. 76, 84. Whilst he talks so much against Impositions, he imposeth Things upon us, which are directly against our Sentiments, and which we have declar'd against.

III. His next Charge consists of several Particulars, which he calls *Special Arts* in me, that deserve particular Notice.

1. That I laid aside the Consideration of Re-ordination, 1 Def. p. 8. and yet treated of it largely, in the Postscript. I laid it aside as not belonging to our Defence; and when that Defence was near printed, I was perswaded to add that Postscript for the Sake of

my

my dissenting Brethren. And I hope it will not be without good Fruit. What a wonderful *Special Art* was this?

2. That *I turn the dreadful Judgment of cutting off impenitent Sinners by Death into a great Mercy.* This is too horrid a Charge to have so light a Name given to it, as my *Special Art*. I said, it is a *Mercy* in general to the World, that Souls are judg'd by a merciful Saviour; that it is comparatively a *Mercy* to Sinners, to be hindred from going on in those Sins that would increase their Damnation. I add, it is a *Mercy* to the Survivours when many Sinners are cut off, who are a Plague to the World; so David saith, *of thy Mercy cut off mine Enemies.* But I am as far from thinking it in it self a *Mercy* for impenitent Sinners to be put past Hope and Help, as he can be. However the Reader must observe, that this Answer was always wav'd as insufficient for our Defence; and another at large insisted upon in two distinct Books, to which now he has not thought fit to make any new Reply.

3. That the same thing is acting according to Law in me, which in others is call'd acting according to their Fancies. For this he quotes our 2d Def. p. 23. which proves the quite

quite contrary, and his Charge is wholly groundless, and without proof.

4. That I run down the Sense of the ejected Ministers about Assent and Consent, and other Things, and yet say, I have nothing to do with them. This he has also in several Parts of his Letter, and p. 316. he challengeth us thus, *Defend your selves as long as you please, provided you let us alone.* We reply,

1st, That it does not appear that the Ejected Ministers in any Body or considerable Number of them, did ever give this to be the Sense of Conformity which he has given. It is true, he quotes 5 or 6 of them, as to some Particulars, who were never empower'd by the Rest to give their Sense; and chiefly he quotes one of them, who has declar'd against this Use or Abuse of his Writings, which Mr. Calamy has put upon them, as we have shew'd 1st Def. p. 118. and more largely 2^d Def. p. 264, 265. It is true, all the Ejected Ministers were dissatisfy'd with the Terms of Conformity; but the Dissatisfaction of many of them might be on other Grounds, in which our Defence is not concern'd. As they might scruple the Renouncing the Covenant, as fearing to involve themselves and others in the Guilt of Perjury. They might be afraid of Scandal, in building again what they had thrown down; and

and submitting to what they thought had been well taken away; and which they before had declar'd against. They might scruple *Re-ordination*, as fearing they might thereby null. their former Ministrations. These and such like things might be the Reasons of their Dissatisfaction; and 'tis very plain that they were so to many. And how then do we run down the *Sense* of the *Ejected Ministers*? We had Reason to say, *we do not concern our selves* with them; no nor so much as to enquire whether those five or six, whom he refers to in his 10th Chapter, be rightly quoted or no: or whether any others, or how many were, or were not of their Mind: and thus we declar'd, 2d Def. p. 91. But,

2dly, If it could be suppos'd that he had given us the *Sense* of the *ejected Ministers*, i. e. of the Body of them; yet what a Jest is it to bid us, *Defend our selves, but not meddle* with their *Sense*? If any think our Practice in any Matter to be unlawful, Can we *defend* the Lawfulness of it, without shewing, that they were mistaken, that thought it unlawful? Our *Congregational Brethren* say, that *Occasional Conformity*, and that Branch of it, which is most contended about, viz. *Kneeling at the Lord's-Supper*, is a symbolizing with the Idolatry of the Church

of Rome, an Encouragement of Imposers, a Hindrance of Reformation, &c. Now if Mr. Calamy vindicates the *Occasional Conformity*, and shews that these Aggravations thereof are unjust, Does he assault the *Congregational Brethren*, or any ways injure them? Yea, May he not defend his Practice of *Occasional Conformity*, against those unjust Imputations, and yet have nothing to do with the *Independents* in the Matter? Is not *Self-Defence* a Duty that every Christian is bound to in proper Seasons? Had we accus'd the ejected Ministers of Sedition, Faction, &c. he might well have said, *Defend your selves, but let them alone.* But to say so to us, who had largely commended them for their excellent Gifts and Graces; and excus'd the Prejudices on which the Mistakes of some of them (who oppos'd the Terms of Conformity which we have defended) were grounded; we judge to be highly unreasonable.

IV. He saith, *I charge him with Mistakes, when all the Mistake is evidently on my own Side.* Of this he pretends to give three Instances. The one, that I say it is a Mistake that a Minister is oblig'd to baptize all Comers, and quotes I Def. p. 26. which he saith is contrary to the Canon. Whereas in that Page 26. I refer'd him to the proper place of that Matter, viz. p. 102. where

what

what I said is made good; and more largely in our Discourse of the *Canons*, 2^d Def. p. 287, &c. The other is about mistaking Dr. Morley, which Mr. Calamy one would think should have ventur'd to say, as we have shewn in this 3^d Defence in its proper place, as we have also the next Instance, viz. his Mistake about the Oath of Canonical Obedience. On which Side the Mistake lies, let the Reader judge.

V. He saith, *That I am guilty of what I accuse my Neighbour.* He instances in,

1. *My taking things upon trust without examining them.* For Proof he mentions, the *Lords Journal*, Mr. *Humphrey's Book*, the *Bishop of London's Episcopalia*. Whereas we took all these to be truly and exactly quoted, as he had quoted them, and gave our Answers accordingly: and knew not of the least Need that we had to examine or consult any one of them. Indeed we mistook one Circumstance in the *Lords Journal*, by his ambiguously wording of it, which we have now largely accounted for in this our third Defence.

2. *My using divers Weights and Measures.* He instances in our accusing him of rendring them odious, whereas we inveigh against the ejected Ministers Sense. This we have at large

large answer'd under the *Third Article* of this *Index*, and in our *applying the Passages* out of *Mr. Baxter's Cure of Church Divisions* to him, and *rejecting them* out of *Mr. Hoadly* as *apply'd to us*. And we affirm, that we had and have just Reason both for the one, and for the other. *Judicet Lector*.

3. *My charging him with using personal Reflections, &c. and forgetting what Language I use*. Now here lies the Difference between his References and ours. He quotes our Books, where these Reflections are found; but refers to no Proof, where they may be shew'd to be unjust. Whereas in our Charge on him, we shew him the Instances wherein his personal Reflections are unjust, and refer him to the Places wherewe have prov'd them so.

VI. *That I wrest the Scriptures in Favour of Notions, that they were never design'd to support*. His Instances are, 1. The *Regeneration of all baptized Infants*; which is only his ambiguous and ill-worded Expression. Whereas in our 1. *Def.* p. 28, 29. and 2d *Def.* p. 135. The Scriptures are so plainly and particularly urged, that in either of his Books he has not shew'd that we have us'd or apply'd them to any other Sense, than what is evidently the Mind of the Holy Ghost therein. 2. *That that may be asserted to be always true which is only true sometimes*. That *all* and *always* is often us'd with Limitation

mitations, is very plain. But we own'd, that what we wrote, 1 Def. p. 71. about this Matter, was not home to our purpose. It is the only Matter of Substance, that we were mistaken in, and therefore recalled 2d Def. p. 213. where we rectify'd the Mistake, and made the Answer right, to which he can return no Reply, and now he dis-ingenuously chargeth us with the Defect that we had before acknowledged and made up.

VII. That I prevaricate, to avoid the Force of his Arguments that pinched me. To prevaricate in Law is, when a Man seems falsely and deceitfully to undertake a Thing with an Intention and Design to destroy it. But what false or deceitful Measures have we taken? Or what cunning Arts have we used? What Tricks of *Legerdemain* can he accuse us of? We undertook the Defence of Conformity, and we have pursu'd it fairly and plainly, and we believe, too strenuously for Mr. Calamy to push it by. And if we had indeed prevaricated in it, I doubt, he would have lik'd it never the worse. Yes, but he saith, I do it in order to the evading the Force of his Argument that pincheth us. No Sir, we turn it by, without any Prevarication in the Case; we argue openly in the Matter; and we defend only what we think is Truth, and that in these very Instances with re-

spect

spect to which this is charg'd upon us, viz.

1. In *pleading our Liberty to use private Baptism when Godfathers are scrupled*; whereas, saith he, the Words, *if the Child live*, are equivalent to the Supposition of Sickness, and by Consequence, that *that Office* must be us'd only in *Danger of Death*. Whereas we have largely shew'd the contrary in our 2d Def. p. 166, &c. and confirm'd it in this 3d Def. and if we have prov'd the Liberty, we may plead it.

2. In our being mov'd with Indignation for his quoting of the 36th Canon in the manner mention'd, 1 Def. p. 48. whereas the Ground of our Reflection was not because two Things refer'd to in that Canon are not in the same Page, but because what he alledgeth in the several Pages of that Canon are not *idem*, they refer not to the same, but different Matters, as we there shew'd, and more largely explain'd 2d Def. p. 175. and now have again confirm'd in this 3d Defence.

3. In our speaking of going out of Town when prest with the Office of Burial. Whereas we there prov'd that we lay under no Obligation to use the Office in the Cases there spoken of; and that to avoid Noise, we could easily withdraw our selves, when any such Cases happened. And where now is our Prevarication in this, to avoid fairly what we are not obliged to.

VIII. That I trifle in calling him to Repentance. 1. Def. p. 44. 84. there he mentions a wrong Cause or Ground of this Call. But as to the Ground on which I did it, I did not trifle, but was very serious, and so I am in the renewing of it.

IX. That I fasten heavy Imputations on innocent Persons. His only Instance is, 1. Def. p. 45. where we charge the confounding common Signs with Sacraments, as the Ground of Ignorance in some, and Socinianism in others. We stand to the Charge. There are two sorts of Signs. 1. Signs of God's Acts, wherein he offers, tenders, or exhibits Grace to Men. 2. Signs of our Acts, whereby we signifie our own Minds or Duties, by Words or Actions. The first sort of Signs are never to be used by us, but when the Lord appoints them. The other are lawful for us to chuse and use, and we have abundant Warrant from the Scriptures so to do. The confounding these is the very Root of the Socinian Doctrine about the Sacraments; and the not distinguishing them is the Ground of the Ignorance of many about the Nature and Number of Sacraments, what they are, and why they are Two, and no more.

X. He saith, I can differ from the common Sense of the Church, and yet be in the right. He instances in receiving to the Sacraments
L those

those that scruple Godfathers and Kneeling. What we say on those Heads, must be seen in our Books, not in his Representation of it in an Index. We have fairly argued the matter, let him confute our Sense, if he can. Is not this a pretty Fancy, to put a part of the Controversie it self into an *Index of Peculiarities*? As to what we have written on these *exclusive Terms*, we say, That if by the Church he means the *Persons* of the present Churchmen, neither he nor we can tell, whether we differ from the common Sense: we are not able to poll them. But if by the Sense of the Church, he means the *Orders* of the present Establishment, we have shew'd how agreeable our Sentiments are thereunto. And he must not think, that his Assertion in this *Index* of their contrariety thereunto will pass for Proof against us.

XI. He saith; *I set down Histories and Authorities that prove, 1. what he never denied; and he instances in several of them.* We are glad to find he allows them: whether we did not urge them to good purpose, let the Reader judge. 2. *That prove the contrary to what I produce them for.* He mentions Bishop Morley's Case in our *Second Defence* p. 188. and this is one of the places that he offers a Reference to his own Book about, viz. his Letter p. 330. And we desire the Reader to judge

of what we are not obliged to

of his way of writing by his own instance. Is there any one Word to prove, that what we produc'd, proves the contrary to what we produc'd in for? Not a tittle. He does indeed endeavour to confront the Testimony we produc'd with other Arguments, particularly with another Passage in Bishop Morley's Book, which we have reply'd to in this *Third Defence*. But the Passage we produc'd was home to our purpose, and nothing therein is pretended to turn against us.

XII. That I groundlessly insinuate, *to what I dare not assert*. His only instance is, That the Presbyterians hindered the Comprehension in 1689. The place he refers to, is a Quotation from an Historian, *Second Defence* p. 29. and now he saith, *We dare not assert it*. He knows well, we *dare not*, and why we dare not. We do not envy him his Privilege, that he dare throw all manner of Dirt upon the Established Church. We can answer well without daring to make Returns; we have no mind to aggravate, but our Design is to heal and compose. 2. *What I never go about to prove, viz. That Conformity is the same in all Points, except the Declaration of Assent and Consent, as it was in the Days of the conforming Puritans, save only wherein it is granted to be alter'd for the better*. This indeed we did assert, and little expected to have a

Denial insinuated: But he saith, *We did not prove it.* Why, truly it would have been too long and needless to have done it; to have gone over all the Parts of Conformity in their time and ours, and shew'd their Agreement (and then he might have said indeed, *That we set down Authorities that he never denied.*)

But if indeed he doubted of this Matter, why did he not instance in some of the Terms of Conformity now, that were not in the days of the old Puritans (except only as we excepted) for our parts we know of none.

XIII. He saith, *That I confidently affirm things contrary to plain Evidence.* His Instances are, 1. That I say, 2^d Def. p. 44, 45. *Mr. Humphreys is for us.* We affirm it, so far forth, as his first Book is for us; which indeed was the very Ground of our *Postscript for Re-ordination*; and so far forth, as his second Book does own two things (as Mr. Calamy himself quotes him, for we need look no further) 1. That what he wrote in his first Book was a *Truth*. 2. That there was a *grand Necessity* upon him at that time to defend it. This was all we affirm'd about him, and this, we say, is for us. And if this be contrary to plain Evidence, then Mr. Calamy has misrepresented him, for we take the Evidence from him. Again, 2. That *I say Mr. Calamy is gone off from the Principles of the*

old
did
but
coun
and
Wor
pres
Per
caus
Chr
dive
and
tha
at,
Imp
stan
in
bec
as a
upo
and
Imp
Con
me
len
to
the
are
the

old Nonconformists, &c. 2. Def. p. 68. But I did not say, He was gone off in every thing, but in those things of which I was there discoursing, and of which I made full Proof; and let him clear himself, if he can.

XIV. He saith, *That I falsely repeat his Words, and deliver his Sense*; because I represent it as his Sense, *That 'tis unlawful for Persons to submit to things lawful, meerly because Superiours require them, to maintain their Christian Liberty*. Now it is evident from divers things in Mr. Calamy's Introduction, and from the Tenour of a great part of it, that 'tis the *Imposition* it self, that he strikes at, and supposeth to be sinful meerly as an *Imposition*, and not only in respect of Circumstances (upon which account, it is confest, in other places he likewise opposeth it) and because of the *Sinfulness* of the *Imposition*, as an *Assuming* too much, and an *Encroachment* upon our Liberty. He thereupon impugns and disputes against the *Submission* to such an *Imposition* and *Encroachment* in our *stated Compliance* therewith, as giving Encouragement thereunto. This I take to be equivalent to the holding it unlawful for Persons to submit to things lawful in themselves in their *stated Compliance*, meerly because they are required by Superiours only to maintain their *Christian Liberty* in indifferent things.

But if Mr. Calamy doth disown this Sense, I have no more to say to it.

XV. That *I carelessly oppose the very Church which I pretend to defend*; because I declare, if *she adds new Ceremonies, as she must determine whether they are fit to be impos'd, so I must determine whether they are fit to be submitted to.* And is this to oppose the Church? Alas, how little does he understand the Church, that he does professedly oppose! She requires all her Members to examine by the Word all her Determinations, by declaring, that *any particular Church may err, &c.* Ave, but he saith, We have own'd her Power. Yes, how? Why, that she has Power to determine Circumstances which are *not contrary to the Word of God, viz. in Matter, Manner, or End, or any other way.* And every one must determine for himself whether the things he submits to, are warrant'd thereby. We do not oppose the Churches Power in any thing that is *warrantable by the Word*; but if any thing be enjoyned that is *contrary to the Word*, we do, and must oppose the Churches Power in that, and we are no more oblig'd than he, thereby.

XVI. He saith, *I urge a way of Reasoning that falls on, and hits my self.* The only Instance is, That the Zeal of the Lords for an *Explanatory Clause* (about the Use of the

Comm-

Common-Prayer, is, he saith, a *strong Argument* against us, That *that* is not the *Sense* of the *Declaration* without that *Explanation*. We answer, No such matter: Their *Zeal* for such an *Explanation* was only a *strong Argument* of the moderate and kind *Inclination* of those *Lords* to bring in the *Nonconformists*, or many of them, by that *Clause*, though they might not think it any other-wise needful. This we have set in a full light in this *Third Defence*. This is accidentally now a part of the *Controversie* between us, and should in all reason be manag'd by *Argument*, and not by putting it in an *Index*.

XVII. He saith, *I wittingly neglect the Explication of his Sense, with relation to the Affair of Mr. Humphreys, in a friendly Message.* I declare I know nothing of the friendly *Message*, nor what *Explication* he means.

XVIII. He saith, *I quibble with Words ambiguously us'd, as about Circumstances and Ceremonies, 2 Def. p. 46, 47, 48.* I appeal to every understanding Reader, let the Places be consulted.

XIX. He saith, *I strangely pride my self in suffering, if there should be occasion, in the way I take, from rigorous Imposers, without considering whether or no God calls me to it, 2d Def. p. 303, 304.* Here we cannot make

the Readers Judges between us, as under the other Heads. For the *Charge* only relates to two things, which can be known only by the *Searcher of Hearts*. 1. That I *pride* my self in *Sufferings*. 2. That I *do not consider whether or no God calls me to Sufferings*. We have nothing to do but to appeal a *Judice non competente*, from this censorious Usurper of God's Prerogative. He saith, lastly, *XX. That I am inconsistent with my self. By owning the Impositions prove Occasions of Division, and yet representing them as expedient for Order and Decency, and to prevent Factions and Divisions, 2d Def. p. 45. with p. 61.* But there is no *Inconsistency*, as these things lie in our *Book*. For the *latter* place speaks of *Determinations in general*, where the *Times and Circumstances* are duly attended to, in which Case they may be of use to that End. But the *former* speaks of the *present Times and Circumstances*, in which we judge there should be an *Abatement* of the *Imposition* of some things, which are less suitable to attain the *Ends* of such *Determinations*, than others might be; though still being lawful, they may oblige the Subject to *Compliance*. He proceeds, That I *make a Distinction without a Difference, between the Principles of the ejected Ministers, and his Representation, which*

he

he would have to be the same. But his giving the Words of five or six of them, does not prove the Principles of the Body of them. And if it did, I might distinguish between them, as to my *Consideration* of the one and the other: and I might omit the *Consideration* of *the one*, while I treated on *the other*, which is what is meant, 2d Def. p. 90.

On the contrary, he saith, That I will not allow a *Distinction* where there is a *Difference*; as between the *Lower House of Convocation*, and me and my *Neighbours*: And again, Between those that have had the *Ascendant* in the *Church*, and such Men as I. Now the Reader must know that this *Difference*, so far as this Debate is concerned therein, is about excluding the scrupulous from the *Sacraments*. And we argu'd upon it, 2d Def. p. 24, to 29. and leave it to the Reader; only adding, 1. as to the late *Representation* of the *Lower House of Convocation*, which he supposeth as different from us as *East* from *West*; we have shew'd the contrary [that it does not at all oppose us] in its proper place in this *Third Defence*. 2. As to those that have the *Ascendant* in the *Church*; He must mean, either, 1. in *Dignity* and *Government*, viz. the *Bishops*; and then he has not brought one *Bishop* to oppose our Sense. For as to *Bishop Morley*, we have prov'd what he saith of him

to

to be all mistake. Or else, 2. *in Number*, viz. That they that are of Dr. F. of *Whit-church's* Judgment, are more than we. We answer, we cannot come to the Poll. We do allow there is, and hath been a Difference amongst Men in their Apprehensions about these things. And the most that can be made of his *History of High and Low Church*, in the beginning of his former Book, is only this, That there have been always some in the Government, that have been very stiff and zealous in pressing the Impositions. But it is also very plain, that there have been great Men in the Church, that have not had the same Sentiments in some things, which Mr. *Calamy* pretends to be only right. In the main *Matters* wherein our *Defence* is concern'd, we find not but both sides in the Church are generally agreed. As we have shew'd him about our Sense of *Assent and Consent*, and he owns that in forty years space there has not been one Book from the hottest Churchman that declar'd against it. Dr. *Burges's* Sense of these things was presented by the Bishop of *Winchester*, and own'd by the *Archbishop* to be the true Sense and Intention of the Church of *England*. The same might be shewn other ways. The Difference between the one and the other, seems to lie in this. There are some that have a higher Opinion of the

Use

Usefulness and Expediency of some things impos'd, which we only plead for the *Lawfulness* of; and as a Consequence of this, they may be apt to commend and extol those things too much, perhaps sometimes with such *Flourishes* and *Figures* as Mr. Calamy owns he has us'd in speaking against them. They also were for imposing these things with *Penalties*, that we are not call'd to own; and as a Consequence of this, they have express themselves too rigidly about *Exclusive Terms* and other Matters, on purpose, as Mr. Baxter thought, to exasperate the *Nonconformists*; to be sure with less Care to satisfy the Scruples, and prevent the Objections of the *Nonconformists*, than they have us'd, who so earnestly desire the Re-union of all good Men to the Church. And we are no more obliged to take the Sense of Conformity from those that Mr. Calamy speaks so much of, as having the *Ascendant*, than from others. Nor for all Mr. Calamy's haste, are they more of the Church, or more for it, or for its true Interest. Yea, and for Numbers, we shall conclude with Mr. Baxter's Words, which we quoted in our *Second Defence*, out of the *Append.* to his *Life* in *Folio* p. 78. where he gives a true Account of the Church of England from the *Articles, Apology, Homilies, Liturgy, Ordination, Canons*; and saith, At last a new sort of *Bishops*

shops rose up----- these call'd themselves the Church of England, when there were but about four or five Bishops left alive, who, Dr. Hammond said, were of his Mind. Some such domineered afterwards, but never prevailed, neither to retract the Churches Books and Laws, nor to get the major Part of the Clergy to own them. Now the main Question is, Which of these two Parties shall be call'd the Church of England? Neither of them alone: they are two disagreeing Parts of it. I argu'd against the last, professing not to do it against the first. We quoted this before, for the sake of the last Clause, to shew, that Mr. Baxter never intended that his Words and Writings should be produc'd against those that Mr. Calamy opposeth. He professeth he did not argue against that Part of the Church of England, that stood to the Articles, Apology, Homilies, Liturgy, Ordination, Canons; but against a domineering Party, as he calls them [the same that Mr. Calamy perhaps means by them that have the Ascendant] that elsewhere are said, to have a part to act, to exasperate the Nonconformists; for so the rigid overdoing and straining things did then, though it may gratifie Mr. Calamy now. These Mr. Baxter meant, and not the other Part of the Church of England, as he professeth. But we have something more to observe from

from this Quotation now; that according to Mr. Baxter, 1. We have the Sense of the Church, in the Articles, Liturgy, Canons, &c. and that the high domineering Men (as he calls them) that had the Ascendant, could never prevail to retract the Churches Books and Laws, which are on our side. 2. That we are the Major Part, and they could never (as he adds) get the Major Part of the Clergy to own them. It seems though they had the Ascendancy in Dignity at some times, that were more hot and dangerous; yet even then they had it not in Number; and we hope that the Numbers of them that were for straining things to an undue Height, on purpose to exasperate the Nonconformists, are now greatly diminished; for if that was their Design, they may see by Mr. Calamy's Writings, that it is now quite spoil'd. Mr. Calamy in his Preface to his last Book, p. 5. tells us, That he had been better pleased, if the confuting of his Representation had been managed by the open Enemies than the avowed Friends of Moderation. And we easily believe that he speaks his very Heart. The hot Carriage of some Men did exasperate, and occasion the Dissention of many at first, as it did of Mr. Rastrick at last; But now (when the Nonconformists have a Law to secure them in the Exercise of their Ministry in the tolerated Churches) all their high

Notions do but gratifie Mr. Calamy, (and if there be any more of his Mind) and highly please him. To have a *Memorialist* represent the Church in Danger by Moderation, and to have such as plead for it *charg'd* (as Mr. Calamy expresseth it) with *designing to undermine* the Church: This justly displeased the Ejected Ministers once, as it does the Nation now. But this is what Mr. Calamy would have: And he is as ready to give them the Name of *The Church*, or being *for the Church*, and *understanding the true Principles of the Church*, as they can be to attribute these Titles to themselves. *There is nothing* (to use his own Expressions) *so discouraging to him in the whole Affair* as that he has not been attacked by these Men only. Then had these angry Men on both sides widened the Difference more, instead of composing it, and by their Exasperations the Argument would have been soon lost in the Scuffle, and we should never have had the Debate brought to an Issue, which now we are in some hopes may be done.

And we easily see how easily his very

Heart. The not carriage of some Men bid ex-
as before, and occasion the Diffusion of many as
ill, as it did of Mr. A. at last. But
now (when the Lord must have a Law
to secure them in the Exercise of their Mini-
stry in the tolerated Churches) all their high

**BOOKS Printed for R. Burrough at
the Sun and Moon in Cornhill.**

Manuductio ad Lectiorem Scripturæ Sacræ, *Augusti Hermannii Franckii*, S. Th. Prof. Hallens. Omnibus Theologiae sacræ Cultoribus commendata, à *Petro Alfo*, S. T. P. cum nova Præfatione, de Impedimentis Studii Theologici, & Appendice, exhibente aliquot Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Scriptorum Loci, ad Illustrationem Opusculi facientia.

Pietas Hallensis: Being an Historical Relation of the wonderful Foot-steps of Divine Providence in Erecting, Carrying on, and Building the *Orphan-House*, and other charitable Institutions, at *Glauchau* near *Hall* in *Saxony*, without any visible Fund to support it. By *Augustus Hermannus Franck*, Professor of Divinity in the *Frederician* University of *Hall*, Pastor of *Glauchau*, and Director of the Pious Foundations there. Continued to the beginning of the Year *MDCCL*. In a Letter to a Friend. And an Appendix giving a more clear and full View of the Progress of Learning and Christian Piety, both in the said University, and in the Royal Collegiate Schools, under the Protection and Patronage of the present King of *Prussia*. To which are added several considerable Papers relating to this Work.

The Harmony of the Holy Gospels digested into one History, according to the Order of Time; divided into Three Hundred and Fifteen Lessons; with suitable Meditations and Prayers subjoyned to each Lesson. Done originally by the Author of the Devotions by way of Offices, Published by Dr. *Hicks*. Reformed and improved by *James Bunnett Esq*; late Accountant-General of *Ireland*, for his own Use. And now published from his own Papers, for the Use of others. By the Author of his Life.

Price, p. 10. bound in Delf. p. 71. M 3. The

The Superintendency of Divine Providence: Being a Sermon preach'd before the Lord Mayor, &c. on the 29th of May, 1705. By Francis Fox, M. A.

The History of Infant-Baptism, in Two Parts. The First being an Impartial Collection of all such Passages in the Writers of the Four first Centuries as do make For or Against it. The Second, containing several Things that do help to illustrate the said History. By William Wall, Vicar of Shroton in Kent.

An Introduction to the History of the Kingdoms and States of Asia, Africa and America, both Ancient and Modern, according to the Method of Samuel Puffendorf, Chancellor of State to the King of Sweden.

Divine Hymns and Poems on several Occasions. Collected from Sir Richard Blackmore, Mrs. Singer, Mrs. Norris, Mr. Dryden, &c. and published to retrieve the Honour of the English Poetry, by employing it on Religious Subjects.

Nicodemus: Or, a Treatise against the Fear of Man. Wherein the Causes and sad Effects thereof are briefly describ'd. With some Remedies against it. Written in High Dutch by Augustus Hermann Franck, Professor of Divinity in the University at Hall, and Minister of Glaucha near Hall. And Dedicated to the Clergy in Germany.

The Harmony of the Holy Gospels digested into one History, according to the Order of Time; divided into three Hundred and Fifteen Lessons; with suitable Meditations and Prayers assigned to each Lesson. Done originally by the Author of the Devotions by way of Office, Published by Dr. H. R. Reform'd and improv'd by James Howell Esq; late Accomptant-General of Ireland, for his own Use. And now published from his own Papers, for the Use of others. By the Author of his Life.

The



INDEX

To this

THIRD DEFENCE,

With some Reference to the former.

(The first Figure notes the Pages of this 3d Defence, the 2d of the other: In which the things are clear'd which are set down under the several Heads following, viz.)

I. **T**HE Concessions and Allowances made by Mr. Calamy in some of the most principal Matters of our Debate.

1. That the Church hath Power to decree and determine some external Circumstances in the Worship of God, p. 6. with 2d Def. p. 47; 164.

2. That the Magistrate may oblige his Subjects to attend on the Worship of God, in the way against which they do not pretend matter of Conscience, p. 18. with 2d Def. p. 71. M 3. That

3. *That the Charge of his Xth Chapter, That the Assent and Consent did mean, the highest Justification of every Point and Syllable, &c. was Hyperbolicall, p. 30. with 2d Def. p. 115.*

4. *That a Sacramental Regeneration is imply'd in the Phrases us'd in the Office of Baptism, and that those Phrases are not blameable, p. 42. with 2d Def. p. 132.*

5. *That Godfathers are very desirable, so far as they are Sureties to the Church for the Education of Children, and that he doth not doubt, but thousands have been brought up to a good understanding and sense of Religion, by the sole Care of Godfathers and Godmothers. — 2d Def. p. 156, 157.*

6. *That he will not censure those that use the Sign of the Cross, nor say, it is unlawful so to do, p. 57. with 2d Def. p. 179.*

7. *That kneeling at the Lord's Supper is lawful; and that his Argument, brought against it, is strain'd, if us'd to prove it unlawful, — 2d Def. p. 156.*

8. *That it is lawful to subscribe to the Use of the Apocryphal Lessons, so far as the VIth Article sets it forth, p. 69. with 2d Def. p. 226.*

9. *That he doth not contend about the Use of the old Version of the Psalms, or the truth of the Proposition objected against in his Xth Chapter, — 2d Def. p. 232.*

10. *That the Athanasian Creed is an excellent*

Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that it is lawful to subscribe to it, in the Words of the VIIIth Article, p. 72. with 2d Def. p. 237.

II. *That our Explication of the Rubrick about Confirmation suits it well enough, and answers the Rubrick, p. 76. with 2d Def. p. 244.*

12. *That the Oath of Canonical Obedience doth not oblige us to obey the Canons that we dislike, till they become the Commands of our Bishop; nor then neither, if upon search they do not appear to us to be lawful and honest, p. 80. with 2d Def. p. 254.*

All these twelve Things he grants and allows,

II. Such matters of the Debate which we had largely insisted on and prov'd, and which Mr. Calamy, in this his last Undertaking, doth wholly pass by.

1. *Our whole Proof of the lawfulness of Re-ordination in some Cases, p. 2. with 2d Def. p. 30.*

2. *Our whole Proof of the lawfulness of the Use of Rites, Ceremonies and significant Actions in the Worship of God, from Scripture-warrant, and Reason, and the allowed Practice of all the Churches, p. 5. with 2d Def. p. 49.*

3. *Our whole Proof of our sense of the Declaration of Assent and Consent, from the end of the Law, and the manner of wording the Declaration it self, p. 33. with 2d Def. p. 124.*

4. *Our whole Proof that the Scriptures use the same and like Phrases, as are found in the*

Office of Baptism, with respect to all that are visible Church-members, and that the same are pertinently us'd, p. 44. with 2d Def. p. 135. 1st Def. p. 29.

5. Our whole Proof that we are not bound to use the Office of Burial, at the Graves of those that die impenitent in gross Sins, p. 65. with 2d Def. p. 204.

6. Our whole Proof that the Rule to find out Easter is a good Rule, p. 66. with 2d Def. p. 215.

7. Our whole Proof of the lawfulness of using the damnatory Sentences in the Athanasian Creed, p. 72. with 2d Def. p. 240.

All these seven Things he passeth by.

III. Such Charges which we had formerly answer'd; and which Mr. Calamy renews and repeats, without taking notice of our Answer, or pretending to reply thereunto.

1. That to use the Passages, objected against in the Office of Baptism, may ensnare People, and tempt them to rest in the outward Ordinances, p. 44. with 2d Def. p. 137.

2. That we are not allowed to Baptize any Children privately, but in case of Sicknes and danger of Death, p. 55. with 2d Def. p. 166.

3. Concerning the exciting signification of the sign of the Cross, as spoken of by Hooker and Comber, p. 58. with 2d Def. p. 184.

4. Concerning the Canon's explaining the Liturgy in case of those that scruple kneeling at the

the Lord's Supper, p. 62. with 2d Def. p. 191.

5. *Concerning the Canon requiring the Burial of all not Excommunicate, &c. p. 65. with 2d Def. p. 208.*

6. *Concerning justling out the Holy Scriptures, and the matter of Scandal, in the using the Apocryphal Lessons, p. 68, 70. with 2d Def. p. 224, 229.*

7. *Concerning Submission to sundry of the Canons of 1603. which he objects against, p. 93; with 2d Def. p. 285--- 297.*

In these seven Things, he continues his Charge, but doth not reply to the plain Answers made thereunto.

IV. Such Matters of this Debate, which though formerly insisted on by us, are here more fully treated on, as Mr. Calamy hath given occasion.

1. *His Insinuation that all determination of Circumstances in Worship, ought to be made by particular Congregations; Answer'd, p. 8. with 2d Def. p. 66.*

2. *His Objection that our Submission doth encourage Imposers; Answer'd, p. 18. with 2d Def. p. 82.*

3. *That the Lords and Commons, by dropping a Clause they debated about, did declare that more ought to be meant, by the Declaration of Assent and Consent, than to the Use; Answer'd, p. 34. with 2d Def. p. 105.*

4. *That*

4. *That Godfathers with us exclude the Parents Right, more than Godfathers in the re-form'd Churches abroad ; Answer'd, p. 45. with 2d Def. p. 141.*

5. *That he is hard put to it to conceive, how the Sign of Christ's Merits can be used, without securing and conveying them ; Answer'd, p. 57. with 2d Def. p. 175.*

6. *His Quarrel about the Title given to the Calendar ; Answer'd, p. 67. with 2d Def. p. 220.*

7. *His mistake about the manner of approving the old Version of the Psalms ; Answer'd, p. 70. with 2d Def. p. 233.*

8. *His Observation, that though we do not violate our Oaths, yet we may be charged by others with doing so ; Answer'd, p. 87. with 2d Def. p. 261, 305.*

These eight Particulars were answer'd before ; but he hath given us occasion to speak to them again, to make every thing more plain.

V. Such things as are new Objections, in Mr. Calamy's last Undertaking, against any part of our Defence, and are here Answered by us.

1. *That the old Puritans were content to use what they did not unfeignedly approve of ; Answered, p. 27.*

2. *His Reply to our Argument from private Baptism, that Godfathers are not intended for the Use he imagins ; Answer'd, p. 47.* 3. *His*

3. His Assertion that the Responses made by Godfathers in the Name of the Children, are much the same with those made by the Marcionites for the Dead; Answer'd, p. 49.

4. That the Representation, made by the late lower House of Convocation, doth oppose the Use of private Baptism, where the Rituals are scrupled; Answer'd, p. 55.

5. That Bishop Morley is against us in the matter of the Liturgy's excluding them that do not kneel; Answer'd, p. 61.

6. His Distinction between the force of an Oath, and the Intention of Men to bind us thereby; Answer'd, p. 82.

7. His Fear that we may cherish in Men an Opinion, that they have Power to oblige us to what is Evil; Answer'd, p. 94.

8. That he would not plead for a Constitution, that exposeth a Minister to Danger for being Conscientious; Answer'd, p. 95.

These eight Particulars contain his now Objections against our Defence; which we have answer'd, and, we hope, shew'd the Reader into how narrow a compals the Debate is brought.

VI. Such things as relate to Mr. Calamy's Defence of himself, his own Subscriptions and Practice.

1. He saith, that in his submitting to Impositions, he doth not own the Power of the Imposers; Answer'd, p. 20.

2. That

2. *That there are no Abuses amongst Dissenters, by wicked Parents being unnatural to their Children, mentioned, p. 53.*

3. *That when exclusive Terms of Communion are used in his, and other dissenting Congregations, the People that scruple them have liberty to remove their Habitations; Answer'd, p. 54.*

4. *That he Subscribes only to a private Reading of Apocryphal Lessons, and not to the reading them in the Assemblies; Answer'd, p. 69. with 2d Def. p. 226.*

5. *That if the Justices allow of his Sense, before whom he Subscribes, he is safe; Reflected on, p. 72.*

6. *That he is not to regard the Sense and Intention of the Church, in subscribing the Articles; He being required to do it by the State; Answer'd, p. 75.*

7. *That by his Oath of Allegiance he is only bound to defend and support the Queen's Person, Crown, and Dignity, according to the Direction of the Laws; Argued on, p. 91. with 2d Def. p. 269, &c.*

These seven Things contain the Heads of his Defence of himself, which we have modestly Reflected on.

5 JY 61

F I N I S.